



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07439596 7

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL:

FOR

MARCH AND JUNE, 1829.

VOL. XXXIX.

Ὁ φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ἐς χέρας· εἰ δέ γε πάμπαν
Νῆϊς ἔφους Μουσέων, ρίψον ἅ μὴ νοέεις.

EPIGR. INCERT.



London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN; C. AND
J. RIVINGTON; PARKER, OXFORD; BARRET, CAM-
BRIDGE; MACREDIE AND CO., EDINBURGH;
CUMMING, DUBLIN; AND ALL
OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1829.

The Numbers are regularly published on the first of April, July, October, and January. Subscribers may, therefore, have them with their Reviews and Magazines, by giving a general order to their Booksellers.

The former Numbers may now be had of all the Booksellers, Price 6s. each ; or in complete sets.

Articles are requested to be sent one month at least before the day of publication, directed to the Printer, Red Lion Court.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXVII.

	Page
On Compound Words in the Ancient Languages	1
Observations on the Power of the 'Ictus Metricus' in Virgilian Hexameters; with some Remarks on Position, Elision, &c. By H. W. WILLIAMS.....	9
Zend and Pahlavi Manuscripts.....	16
An Inquiry into the Truth of History	20
Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, in answer to his De- fence of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7. By R. PORSON	33
On the situation of the Hades of Homer.....	80
Philological Extracts from E. H. BARKER's Letters on the Authorship of Junius's Letters.....	92
Biblical Criticism	96
Corruption of Demiurgus	101
On the Writings of Ausonius	103
Notice of 'Travels in Arabia; comprehending an Account of those Territories in Hedjáz which the Mohammed- dans regard as sacred.' By the late J. L. BURCK- HARDT	113

Notice of 'Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum; ed AUG. BOECKHIUS'	
Notice of 'Θησαυρὸς τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης: Thes Græcæ Linguae; Ab H. STEPHANO constructus'.	
Notice of 'Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη: The New Testament English Notes, Critical, Philological, and Expla &c.	
Oxford Latin Prize Poem for 1775: — Alfredus; — WARTON	159
Notice of Variorum Edition of Plato	162
Notices of Foreign Works	166
Literary Intelligence	180
Correspondence	185

FOR THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION.

Short and Familiar Notes on the Persæ of Æschylus	130
Blomfield's Canons	141

CONTENTS OF NO. LXXVIII.

	Page
Additional Notice of CARDWELL's Nicomachean Ethics	189
On the Difference in the Chronology of the Samaritan and Greek Versions and the Hebrew Text of the Scrip- tures	207
Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum; edidit AUG. BOECK- HIUS	214
Selections from BAYLY's Psychæ, or Songs on Butterflies, &c. Translated into Latin by Archdeacon WRANG- HAM	246
The Ancient Fragments; containing, what remains of the Writings of Sanchoniatho, Berosus, Abydenus, Me- gasthenes, and Manetho; also the Hermetic Creed, &c. Translated by J. P. CORY, Esq.	250
PETTIGREW's Bibliotheca Sussexiana	273
Classical Criticism	305
Nugæ, No. XXIV	306
The Travels of Ibn Batûta, translated by Prof. LEE	309
An Inquiry into the Truth of History	317
On the Mysteries of Eleusis	332
On the Epic Poetry of the Romans.....	33
Classical Criticism. S. FABER	33

-cinium,
dei-ficus,
-fodina, au-
/II. A

	Page
Adversaria Literaria, No XLVIII. Deification of Cleopatra and Cæsarion by the Egyptians—Herodotus Vindi- cated—Inscriptions	346
Foreign Works	349
Literary Intelligence	355
Correspondence	361

FOR THE PURPOSES OF EDUCATION.

Classical and Philological Extracts from Dr. JOHNSTONE'S Life of PARR.....	221
The Pupil's Metrical Companion to Homer; by H. W. WILLIAMS	337

ADDENDA TO THE ARTICLE ON CARDWELL'S NICOMACHEAN ETHICS, p. 189.

We beg our readers to consider the following remarks as part and parcel of the first article in this number:

In p. 190. add, after line 31, the following paragraph:—

1. 9. 11. Suidas. *Διονύσιος ἱστορικὸς τὰ μετὰ Δαρεῖον ἐν βιβλίοις ε΄. Περί-
γησιν οἰκουμένης. Περσικὰ Ἰάδι διαλέκτῳ. Τρωικῶν βιβλία γ΄. Μυθικά. Κό-
κλον ἱστορικὸν ἐν βιβλίοις ζ΄.* This Dionysius is mentioned by Diodorus (iii.
65.) and Cicero (de Divin. l. 23.); but his date is not known. *Τρωικὸς* and
Ἡρωικὸς are confounded in Herod. ix. 27. 5. where *Τρωικὸς* is the right reading.

P. 194. l. 39. for "though it is," read "though it is not."

P. 195. l. 6. See also Matthiæ Gr. Gr. § 523. 2. new edition, where the rule
on this use of *ἂν εἰ* is clearly and correctly laid down.

In p. 196. add, after line 14, the two following paragraphs:—

9. Thucyd. viii. 96. *καὶ ὅσον οὐκ ἤδη ἐνόμιζον αὐτοὺς παρῆναι, ὅπερ ἂν, εἰ πολ-
μπρότεροι ἦσαν, οὐκ ἂν ἐγένετο.*

10. Aristot. Pol. p. 366 C. *καὶ γὰρ ἂν, εἰ κατὰ μέγεθος διενέμοντο τὰς ἀρχὰς*

^a *κατὰ κάλλος, ὀλιγαρχία ἦν ἂν.*

line 36. The passage of Aristotle de Somn. et Vig. p. 685 A. *κὰν εἰ
u.* is printed in Mr. Bekker's new edition, p. 102. 7. *καὶ εἰ τοῦτο γίνε-
τομ Μss.*

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL;

Nº. LXXVII.

MARCH, 1829.

ON COMPOUND WORDS IN THE
ANCIENT LANGUAGES.

THE ancient languages have a great advantage over modern languages by the facility with which they form their compounds. The Greek, especially, is inexhaustible in compounds; the Latin is not half so rich, and many of the Latin compounds are only found in the old poets. Even the German language possesses a far greater store of compounds than the Latin. The modern Greek still uses a number of them in familiar conversation. On examining the mode in which compounds are formed, we find that two originally independent words are united by means of a vowel, or sometimes without it, or by joining the two words in such a manner that the flexion of the first word can be preserved.

Compounds are beautiful when *two* ideas are comprehended in *one* image, but much less beautiful if one idea is expressed by *two* words. Thus the Latin *malus, vinea, lotrix, mulctra*, and many others, are preferable to the English *apple-tree, vineyard, washer-woman, milk-pail*.

The vowel by which compounds are formed is always a short vowel.

(*A.*) in the Latin *i*: this is not the *i* of the casus, because we find it after all nouns of every declension and gender, even after such, which occur only in the plural.

Instances of the first are: *stilli-cidium, sylvi-cola, terri-cola, virgi-demia*, (as *vin-demia*, a *demendo*,) *causi-dicus, aquili-fer, stelli-fer, bacci-fer*, &c. *lani-ficus, aqui-folium, terri-gena, ali-ger, barbi-ger, lani-ger*, &c. *nugi-gerulus, herbi-gradus, aqui-legium, spici-legium, capri-mulgus, equi-mulgus, sagitti-potens*.

Instances of the second declension are: *ligni-cida, galli-cinium, auri-fer, anni-fer, belli-fer, caduci-fer*, &c.; *lucri-ficus, dei-ficus*, (as *dei-loquus, dei-para*,) *veli-ficus, auri-fodina, argenti-fodina, au-*

VOL. XXXIX. Cl. JI. NO. LXXVII. A

ri-fur, cocli-gena, armi-ger, belli-ger, armi-lustrum, hirci-pes, soni-pes, lucri-peta, hirci-pilus, armi-potens, belli-potens, vini-potor, fœni-secium, lecti-sternium.

Instances of the third declension are: muni-ceps, muri-ceps, parti-ceps, homi-cida, infanti-cida, lapi-cida, and lapidi-cida, (from the old lapis, gen. lapis, lapicida,) matri-cida, parri-cida (pro patricida), regi-cida, muri-cidus (Plautus, a coward, a rat-catcher), marti-cola, monti-cola, rupi-cola, ruri-cola, pietati-cultrix, juridicus, flori-fer, frondi-fer, frugi-fer, imbri-fer, &c. morti-ferus, arti-fex, carni-fex, &c.: honori-ficus, muni-ficus, cruci-fixus, melli-fluus, rori-fluus, æri-fodina, ossi-fragus, aquiloni-gena, serpenti-gena, soli-gena, marti-genus, crini-ger, flori-legium, hæredi-peta, vesti-plicus, auri-scalpium, vesti-spicus, sanguisuga, su-ovitaurlia, monti-vagus, nocti-vagus, igni-vomus, carni-vorus.

There are few instances of the fourth declension: algi-ficus, arci-potens, corni-ceu, corni-ger, corni-pes, domi-duca, domi-porta (snail), flucti-cola, flucti-geua, fructi-fer, geli-cidium.

Of the fifth declension I know no example, except some words of barbarous Latinity, as speci-ficus from species; perhaps fidei-commissum, rei-vindicatio, may also be quoted.

In compounds with adjectives the adjective may again belong to the first three declensions.

Examples of the first and second declension: parvi-collis, unicaulis, uni-cornis, uni-jugis, miseri-cors, vani-dicus, veri-dicus, soli-ferreus, magni-ficus, largi-fluus, alieni-gena, tardi-gradus, magni-loquus, multi-loquus, versuti-loquus, vivi-para, fissi-pes, longi-pes, solidi-pes, tardi-pes, multi-scius, alti-sonus, rauci-sonus, soli-vagus, alti-volans.

Example of the third declension: omni-gena, omni-medens, brevi-loquus, blandi-loquus, dulci-loquus, gravi-loquus, suavi-loquus, gracili-pes, levi-pes, levi-somnus, &c.

Sometimes the vowel which unites the two words together is wanting, if the second word begins with a vowel: celt-iberi, pusill-animis, sun-ambulus, somn-ambulus, noct-ambulo; sometimes also before consonants: man-ceps, man-cipium p. mani-ceps, (cf. muni-ceps,) man-suetus p. mani-suetus, Gr. χειρο-ιθης, vin-demia p. vini-demia, (cf. virgi-demia,) sol-stitium p. soli-stitium, (cf. armi-stitium,) puer-pera p. pueri-pera, as pueri-cida, perhaps also lus-cinia; or is the derivation from lux and cano false, and is luscinia from luscus, luscinus, therefore luscinia, the blinded singing-bird?

Avi sinks into *au*: nau-fragium p. navi-fragium, au-ceps, aucupium, p. aviceps, avi-cupium, au-gur p. avigur.

The letters of derivation remain in the first word, as the examples of the third declension show; infant, infant-i-cida: hence it is clear that infans, pons, pietas, stand for infant-s, pont-s, pietat-s, as in the Greek ἑμωτος, ἑμωτης, ἑμως.

Lapidi-cida, lapi-cida, prove a double form lapid-s, and lap-is: unless lapicida is a contraction.

We must notice the falling-off of the *in* in the words *homi-cidium*, *sangui-suga*, not *homini-cidium*, *sanguini-suga*. There is no Latin compound, where the *in* is preserved; for the word *semini-verbium* is of latter formation; it enters, however, partially into derivations, as *graminosus*, *seminosus*, *ominosus*, &c.

The *i* and *u* of the derivation gives way to the vowel of composition, as the examples of the fourth declension show; scarcely any compounds are formed with those that end in *ia* and *ius*: the long vowel of *tibicen* is formed by *tibi-i-cen*; but why is the *i* short in *medi-dies*, *medi-terraneus*, *medi-tullium*?

The *u* sometimes absorbs the vowel of composition; thus we find *arcu-potens*, *cornu-peta*: *manu-factus*, *manu-missus*, *manu-scriptus*, are improper compounds by means of the ablative case of the noun: *manu-pretium* stands for *manus-pretium*, and *domutio* probably for *domum-utio*.

Has the *qu* in *hirqui-tallus*, *sterqui-linium*, where we have also *hirci-tallus*, a *u* of derivation? This *qui* is not found in compounds of *acus*, *arcus*, *pecus*, *specus*, *lucus*, *quercus*, &c.

The first word is sometimes obscure, e. g. *aru-spex*, or *haru-spex*, cf. *au-spex* p. *avi-spex*, *meri-dies* from *merus*? or p. *medi*? Sometimes the second word, as in *mani-festus*.

The composition produces new adjectives from substantives without the vowel of derivation; as *levi-somnus*, *magn-animus*, *hirci-pilus*, *longi-pes*, *miseri-cors*, and with the vowel of derivation in *pusill-animis*, *parvi-collis*, (cf. *im-berbis*, *im-bellis*, *de-pilis*, &c.) Can compounds of verbs be formed? Generally they can only be formed from compound nouns; consequently *tergi-versor* presupposes a *tergi-versus*: the composition with the participle, as *altivolans*, *omni-medens*, does not seem to establish a rule for the rest of the verb.

Those which end in *-fico* (they are very numerous), *ædi-fico*, *ludi-fico*, *lucri-fico*, *melli-fico*, *nidi-fico*, *turpi-fico*, *veli-fico*, &c. are grounded on words with *-fex*; but those in *-fero*, *-feror*, as *voci-fero*, *pesti-fero*, (adject. in *-fer*,) *magni-facio*, *floc-ci-facio*, *floc-ci-pendo*, *parvi-duco*, *parvi-facio*, *parvi-pendo*, do not seem to be derived from nouns: they might be improper compounds with the genit. *floc-ci*, *magni*, *parvi*, if it were not for *vili-pendo*, which can hardly come from the gen. *vilis*.

Compounds of verbs with verbs are all in *-facio* and *-fio*: *cale-facio*, *frige-facio*, *labe-facio*, *ol-facio* p. *ole-facio*, *pate-facio*, *putre-facio*, *nigre-facio*, *terre-facio*, *torre-facio*, *tume-facio*, &c. where the *e* is not the vowel of composition, but the *e* of the second conjugation, although no such form as *labeo*, *nigreo*, exists. It may have existed. *Cale-facio* is not a compound of *calere-facio*, as it might appear, for the vowel *e* in *cale-facio* is short; and we have also the compounds *cale-fio*, *tepe-fio*, and where we cannot think of an infinitive. Why do verbs of the first, third, and fourth conjugations not form such compounds? Those in *-eo* are all intransitive.

(B.) The Greek vowel for forming compounds of nouns of every gender and of every declension is *o*. There is an immense number of such compounds, and we shall only give a few examples.

From the first declension: ἀραχνο-ῦψής, γεο-ειδής, usually γεω-ειδής, ἡμερο-φύλαξ, κορο-κόσμιον, μελισσο-τρόφος, νικο-ποιός, νυμφο-γενής, ὕλο-δρόμος.

From the second declension: ἄρτο-θήκη, γερανο-μαχία, ἵππο-νόμος, μυλο-κόπος, οἰκο-δόμος, ὄνο-ειθής, σκοτο-μήδης, ῥοδο-δάκτυλος, στρατο-λόγος, ταυρο-βόλος, τοπο-γράφος, τοξο-βόλος, ὕπνο-φανής, χρυσο-φανής.

From the third declension: μελιτο-ειδής, μυο-μαχία, νυκτο-ειδής, ὀρνιθο-λόγος, πιτυο-κάμπτης, πνευματο-ποιός, ποδο-στράβη, ῥίνο-βόλος, φοινικο-τρόφος, χειρο-μαντεία, χιονο-βόλος.

And with adjectives of the first and second: αὐτο-κύριος, γυμνο-πόδης, ἰσο-βαθής, καλο-διδάσκαλος, μεσο-φανής, ὁμοιο-παθής:—of the third: ἀρσено-γενής, μελανο-κόμης, τερενο-πλόκαμος.—(With regard to the Greek declensions, we refer to Matthiæ's Gr. Grammar.)

If sometimes an *η* and *α* appear instead of the *ο* of composition, it appears to be derived in the first declension from the flexion. For instance: δαμαλη-φάγος, δαφνή-φαγος, with δαφνο-γνηθής, δαφνο-φόρος (Lob. ad Phryn. 634—638.), νυμφα-γενής, κορυφα-γενής, μιτρα-φόρος, with μιτρο-φόρος, μιτρο-χίτων, νυμφο-γενής, νυμφό-κλαυτος (Lob. p. 641.). But then also substantives of the first and second declension and adjectives have the *η*, θαλαμη-πόλος, ὄμφαλη-τόμος, (Lob. p. 650 seq.) ἀνθη-φόρος, ἀχθη-φόρος, στεφη-πλόκος, βοτρυη-φόρος, βοη-νόμος (Lob. 679, 680.). How can we account for it? Are the dialects wavering between *ο*, *α*, *η*, or is it poetical licence?

The accent very often falls on the vowel of composition, especially if the second word stands in a passive signification, and where the relation of the first word to it can be expressed by a preposition; e.g. ἱππό-νομος, also ἱππο-νόμος, λιθο-βόλος, and λιθό-βολος, throwing stones, and thrown with stones. Cf. Buttman Gramm. § 106, 9, 3.

In other cases no such distinction can be made; e.g. ῥοδο-κόλπος and ῥοδο-δάκτυλος, μελανό-κομος and μελανο-κόμης, the different accentuation does not change the meaning of the words.

The vowel of composition is wanting, 1. when the second word begins with a vowel, τοπ-άρχης, κυν-αλώπης, ποδ-ώκης; but it appears sometimes before *ει* and *ε*, ἀγαθο-εργός, καλο-εργός, μονο-ειδής, κυνο-ειδής; by contraction *η* and *ου*: 2. sometimes after *ν*, μελαγ-χρής p. μελανο-χρής, μελάμ-φυλλος p. μελανό-φυλλος: 3. as in the Latin *ναυ-βάτης*, *ναύ-κληρος*, and others.

The letters of derivation remain, and especially the vowels *ι* and *υ* in derivations with voc. put.; e.g. πολιο-ειδής, εὔρυο-δίνης, ἰχθυο-νόμος, ἰχθυο-φάγος. The vowel of composition is oftener lost, as ἰχθυ-φάγος, εὔρυ-δίνης, γλυκυ-δερκής, δορύ-μαχος, πλατύ-φυλλος, ταχυ-πόρος, μελι-πῆδης, πτολι-πόρθος, νυκτι-φανής. Remarkable also is

αἰμο-χαρής p. αἵματο-χαρής, like sangui-suga p. sanguini-suga.

In the second word adjectives change by the composition the -us into -ης: βαθύς, ἰσο-βαθής; βαρύς, γυνιο-βαρής; θαρσύς, λυκο-θαρσής; ἡδύς, μελι-ηδής, &c. Cf. Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 534 seq. Thus also φανός, and comp. -φανής, and the substantive εἶδος and the comp. -ειδής, the Latin animus and animis, exanimis.

Compound verbs presuppose nouns: ἔργο-λαβέω, κρεω-φαγέω p. κρεο-φαγέω, μυρο-πωλέω, ὄνειρο-πολέω, οἶωνο-σκοπέω, οἰκο-δομέω, ῥαβδο-νομέω, τρωγλο-δυτέω, and many others must be derived from ἔργο-λαβος, κρεω-φάγος, μυρο-πώλης, ὄνειρο-πόλος, οἶωνο-σκόπος, οἰκο-δύμος, ῥαβδο-νόμος, τρωγλο-δύτης, &c. Cf. Butt. § 106. Lobeck ad Phryn. 560 seqq. shows, that we cannot apply any inference from compound participles to the rest of the verb. In the modern Greek such words as νυκτο-φυλάσσω occur.

The languages derived from the Latin, the Italian, Spanish, and French, have lost the power of forming compounds. It is true they have preserved some Latin compounds; e. g. Ital. artificio, edificio, fruttifico, multiplice, mani-festo, magni-loquo, grandi-loquo, nau-fragio, &c.; Span. agri-cultura, ampli-ficar, cuelli-erguido, cuelli-corto, veri-dico, &c.; French, mani-feste, magni-fique, arti-fice, multi-plier; but these compounds are not felt as such, but as simple words: nor can these languages form any new compounds. In the old French we meet with some compounds without the vowel of composition, as fer-armé, iron-armed; fer-vesti, iron-clothed; pié-poudreux, foot-dusty.

Improper compounds are seldom found in the Latin, as with the gen. legis-lator, trium-vir, duum-vir: the gen. follows generally. In the Greek such compositions with the genitive are more frequent, especially with proper names: διός-κορος; διός-πολις, ἑλλήσ-ποντος, ἄλος-ἄχνη, sea-foam, for ἄλος ἄχνη; ὕδατος-ύδνη; κυνά-βατος, κυνός-ουρα, ἀνδρός-αιμον, βόσ-πορος; μνός-ωτον; ὀνού-γναθος, name of a promontory in Laconia; νεώς-οικος; ἵος-κύαμος. Sometimes compounds are formed of analogous names; e. g. λεοντο-πόδιον; ὀνό-πορδον; ὀνό-χηλος; λυκό-πους. The σ remains in λυκο-σύρα.

Compounds with dative and ablative are found in Latin in adjectives and part. præs.; as manu-fortis, manu-captus, mente-captus, acu-pictus, acu-pictor, usu-capio. But these instances are very rare: in the Greek, however, there are a great number of them; e. g. ἄλι-βατος, ἄλι-δινής, νυκτι-λαμπής, νυκτι-πόρος, πυρι-φλεγής, δορι-πετής, δορι-τμητος, γαστρί-δουλος, ποδί-κροτος, χειρί-σοφος, ἔγχει-βρομος (hasta furens) ἔγχει-μαργος; ὄρει-βάτος (in monte ambulans) ὄρει-δρόμος (in monte currens); ἔγχεσι-μωρος (hastis pugnans); ἐντεσι-εργος (in armis laborans); ναυσι-βάτης (nauta) ναυσι-θοος (navibus celer) ναυσι-κλυτος (navibus clarus); ὄρεσι-βάτης (per montes ambulans) ὄρεσι-τροφος (in montibus altus); τειχεσι-πλήτης; τελεσι-δρομος (ad fines currens). Sometimes the last ι is dropped:

τελες-φόρος (ad finem perducens); *έγχες-φόρος* (hastifer,) *έγχές-παλος* (lanceam vibrans); *έπές-βολος* (rixosus); *κερας-φόρος* (corniger,) *κερας-βόλος*; *σακές-παλος* (clypeum vibrans); *σακες-φόρος*.

What is the reason that compounds are only formed with datives of the third declension, and not with datives of the first and second? Might not, in *όδοι-πόρος*, *όδοι-πλανής*, *πυλοι-γενής*, *σκοτοι-βόρος*, the *οι* arise from the *φ*, and the *αι* from *α* in *γυναι-μανής*, so that we need not have recourse to *γυναικο-μανής*? But this does not apply to *κελαι-νεφής* p. *κελαινο-νεφής*: cf. Lob. p. 647.

In many cases the vowel of composition is used, in order to form a euphonious composition, instead of the dative; e. g. *όρό-κτυπος* (in monte sonans), *χειρό-κτυπος*, *σακο-φόρος*, κ. τ. λ.

Compounds with the accusative are rarely found: *έως-φόρος* and *φως-φόρος* seem to be instances of accusatives, since we find also *φωτο-φόρος*. The Latin *anim-adverto* comes evidently from *animum adverto*.

Mere apposition with full flexion of both words takes place in the Latin *res-publica*, *jus-jurandum*, *usus-fructus*, gen. *rei-publicæ*, *juris-jurandi*. The frequent use of these words was the cause of the apposition.

The Latin words *bene-ficium*, *bene-volus*, *male-ficium*, *male-sanus*, and the Greek *εύ-εργός*, *δυσ-εργής*, are compounds of adverbs, as in French *bien-fait*, *mal-fait*, *bien-vaillant*.

The Greek language has compounds of a particular kind, which cannot be found in the Latin or German languages. The idea which stands first occupies, in the usual compounds, the second place. The compounds of this kind are not very numerous, but of a bold cast.

The first word is a verb, generally in the future, rarely in the present. The following are examples of the present: *άγέ-στρατος*, dux, army-leader; *άκειρε-κόμης* hair-cutter; *άρχέ-κακος* auctor mali, *άρχέ-λαος* princeps, *άρχέ-πλουτος* auctor divitiarum, *άρχέ-χορος* p. *χορηγός*; *δακέ-θυμος*; *έλκε-τρίβων*, *έλκε-χίτων*; *έχέ-θυμος*, *έχε-νήϊς*; *μενέ-λαος* populum sustinens? populum expectans? *μενέ-μαχος* pugnam sustinens, *μενέ-χαρμος*; *τελέ-αρχος* minister, *τελέ-νικος* perficiens victoriam; *τρεχέ-δειπνος* ad epulas currens; *φερέ-βορνος*, *φερέ-ζυγος* jugifer, *φερέ-κακος* ferens malum, *φερέ-νικος*, *φερέ-οικος* domi-porta; *φιλ-άδελφος* amans fratrem, *φιλ-αίμων* sanguinarius, *φιλ-έλλην*, *φιλ-έσπερος*.

Examples of the future are: *άγεσί-λαος* dux populi, *άγεσί-χορος* dux chori; *άερσί-νοος* animum extollens, *άερσί-πους* pedes cito movens; *άλφεί-βοιος* boves nanciscens; *άρχεί-μολπος* cantum ducens; *έλκεσί-πεπλος*, *έλκεσί-χειρος*, *ένοσί-γαιος* terram quatiens, *ένοσί-φυλλος* folia quatiens, *ένοσι-χθών* terram quatiens; *έρασί-μολπος* cantum amans, *έρασι-πλόκαμος* cirrum amans, *έρασι-χρήματος* avarus; *έρυσι-θριξ* crines pectens, *έρυσι-πολις* urbem servans, *έρυσι-σκηπτρον*, *έρυσι-χθων* terram arans, *έρυσι-γαῖος*; *δαμασί-βροτος* homines domans,

δαμασί-φρων domans animum; δεισι-δαίμων deum timens, δεισί-θεος; δεξι-δωρος dona ferens, δεξι-μηλος donans oves; δεξι-θυμος mordens animum, δεξι-χερής mordens manum; διωξι-κέλευθος incitans ad iter, διώξι-ιππος agens equos; ζευξι-λέως p. λαός subjugans populum, ζεύξι-ιππος jugans equos; κινήσι-φυλλος folia movens, κινήσι-χθων terram movens; κλεψί-γαμος mæchus, κλεψί-νοος furens animum, κλεψί-τόκος clam pariens; κρατησί-μαχος vincens bello, κρατησί-πους pede fortis, κρατής-ιππος domans equos; λυσι-γαμος solvens conjugium, λυσι-δικος solvens litem, λυσι-ζωνος discinctus, λυσι-μαχος solvens pugnam, λυσι-μελής solvens membra, λυσι-μέριμνος solvens curas, λυσι-πονος solvens labores, λυσι-φρων solvens mentem; μελησί-μβροτος p. μελεσί-βροτος qui in cura hominum est; νηξι-πους natans pedibus; όρσι-κτυπος ciens turbas, όρσι-νεφής nubes cogens; πανσι-λνπος sedans dolorem, πανσι-νοσος medens, πανσι-νύσταλος pellens somnum; πεισι-μβροτος homines moderans, πεισι-χάλινος freno obediens; πηξι-ιππος (ιπό-δαμος); πηγεσί-μαλλος lanam figens, firmans, and then firmus lana; ρυσι-διφρος currum regens, ρυσι-πολις urbem servans; σεισι-χθων terram movens, σεισι-φυλλος folia movens; στρεψί-μαλλος lanam crispans, and then crispus; ταμεσί-χρως secans cutem; ταραξι-κάρδιος cor quatiens, ταραξι-ιππος; τερψί-βροτος exhilarans homines, τερψί-νοος, τερψί-χορος; τισί-φονος cædem ulciscens; φαεσί-μβροτος hominibus lucens; φιλησί-μολπος amans cantum, φιλησι-στέφανος; φθισί-βροτος hom. perdens, φθισί-φρων mentem perdens; ώλεσι-θυμος animam perdens, ώλεσι-καρπος fructum perdens, ώλεσι-οικος domum perdens, ώλεσι-τεκνος liberos perdens, κ. τ. λ.

From the second word of these compounds other forms have been introduced, e. g. from *ἐνοσιφυλλος*, *κινήσιφυλλος*, *σεισιφυλλος*; such as *φυλλαχόος*, *φυλλοσινής*, *φυλλόρροος*. The latter cannot be considered as proper compounds; for the vowel of composition is wanting, and we observe a verbal flexion, whereas every verbal flexion is excluded from compounds. We cannot account otherwise for compounds of this kind, than that they arise from two words being forced together, like *όρεσι-τροφος*, *ναυσι-πορος*. Some might appear to be formed from feminines; e. g. *κινήσι-φόρος*, *τερψί-χορος*, from *κίνησις* and *τέρψις*: but this is not the case; for *λυσι-μαχος*, *ρυσι-πολις*, have, like the future *λύσω*, *ρύσω*, a long *υ*, whilst the feminine *λύσις*, *ρύσις*, *θύσις*, *φύσις*, *χύσις*, have a short one.

The *άγε*, *άρχε*, in *άγέ-λαος*, *άρχέ-λαος*, is evidently a form of the imperative *præs.*, and therefore *άγεσι-λαος*, *άρχεσι-λαος*, being parallels to the former, might be antiquated forms of a future imperative. We know the grammars do not exhibit any imperative nor any subjunctive in the future, although this tense does not necessarily reject those moods. According to the analogy of *aor. 1. imper. σείσον*, *φιλήσον*, the *fut. 1. imp.* might have been *σεισι*, *φιλησι*. The great antiquity of such an imperative shows itself in the forms *άγεσι*, *άρχεσι* instead of *άξι*, *άρξι*, although the *fut. imp.* of these

words standing by themselves is *ἄξω*, *ἄρξω*, instead of *ἀγίσω*, *ἀρχέσω*. We find, however, also, *διώξι* and *κλέψι* in the compounds; but again *λείψ-ήνορ* p. *λείψ-ανδρος*, and *λιπό-δερμοσ* circumcising, together with *λειπό-δερμοσ*. The second word of such compounds was originally dependent on the transitive verb; but in time the case was forgotten, and a genitive was formed of the new compound, as in English the Wife of *Bath's* tale.

Λυσι-μαχος arose undoubtedly from *λυσι-μάχην*; but the flexion was thrown off, and the termination *ος* was added to the compound. These remarks will suffice to show the difference between *δακέ-θυμοσ* and *θυμο-δακής*, or *μισο-άρτροσ* and *άρτρο-μισῶν*, *λεξι-θησ* and *θηρι-λεξής*. Cf. Lob. p. 628. Sometimes these compounds have after the present and future the vowel of composition; e. g. *λειπό-γαμοσ*, *λειπό-θυμοσ*, *φιλό-τεκνοσ*, *φιλό-στροφοσ*, *μισό-παισ*, *μισό-ξενοσ*, *λειψό-θριξ*, *σεισο-πυγίς*, *σεισό-φυλλοσ*, p. *λειπέ-γαμοσ*, *λειψί-θριξ*. But these may be considered as exceptions from the general rule. As the language was wavering between *ὀρεσί-τροφοσ* and *ὀρό-τροφοσ*, so from *σεισί-φυλλοσ* an irregular word *σεισό-φυλλοσ* was formed.

Sometimes the first word is not a verb, but a noun. The union again takes place by means of the vowel of composition; as, *κλυτό-καρποσ*, *κλυτό-τοξοσ*, *ἵππο-γέρανοσ*, *ἵππο-πόταμοσ*. These compounds are against the general rule, for one would expect *τοξό-κλυτοσ* (*arci potens*), *καρπό-κλυτοσ*, &c.

The Latins have some compounds of the same kind; e. g. *motacilla*, *motans*; *agitans caudam*, from *cilla*, an old word for *cauda*. Does *mulci-ber* come from *mulce-ferrum*? *Flexanimus* (Varro, Nonius, Catull.) p. *flect-animus*, seems to be an imitation of *πλεξι-θυμοσ*. But *flexare* may have been used for *flectere*. The *Romanic* languages abound in this sort of compounds: Ital. *bacia-mano*; *bacia-pile*, *bacia-polvere*, *caccia-lupi*, *caccia-diavoli*, *guarda-corpo*; *guarda-boschi*, *passa-tempo* (*pastime*), *porta-mantello*, *taglia-borse*, *tira-boschi*, *torna-sole* (*heliotropium*), *torna-letto*. Spanish: *besa-mano*, *gana-pan*, *garda-fuego*, *guarda-joyas*, *lora-duellos*, *mira-sol* (*heliotropium*), *mata-buey*, *mata-candelas*, *monda-dientes*, *monda-orejas*, *passa-mano*, *passa-tiempo*, *quita-cuidados*, *quita-pesares*, *saca-mano*, *saca-mancha*, *saca-muelas*, *saca-peloras*, *tira-sol*. French: *baise-main*, *brise-fer*, *casse-cou*, *casse-noix*, *casse-tête*, *chante-pleure*, *chasse-chien*, *chasse-cousin* (*sour wine*, which drives a friend out of the house), *chasse-ennui*, *chasse-loup*, *chasse-mouches*, *chasse-rage*, *chauffe-chemise*, *chauffe-lit*, *chauffe-pied*, *chausse-pied*, *coupe-gorge*, *coupe-tête*, *cure-dent*, *cure-oreille*, *cure-pied*, *gagne-denier*, *gagne-pain*, *garde-bon*, *garde-corps*, *garde-chasse*, *garde-feu*, *garde-manger*, *hoche-queue* (*motacilla*), *perce-muraille*, *porte-chaise*, *porte-voix*, *tire-bouchon*, *tourne-broche* (*turn-spit*), &c. These examples show that the second word is an accusative, and this accusative is sometimes even of the plural number. The Greek language proceeds more boldly, by suppressing the flexion,

Observations on the Power of the Ictus, &c. 9

and by adding to the second word new terminations, which are again used for every gender; e. g. παρθένοι ἀλφεσί-βοιαι. The English language has also compounds of this kind; as, break-fast, break-neck, break-stone (saxi-fraga), hang-dog, kill-cow, kill-buck, *Shake-spear* (ἐγχείσπαλος or σείσασγχος), smell-smock, toss-pot, whip-hand, wry-neck, fare-well, hold-fast, look-out, run-away. But the Anglo-Saxon has no such compounds.

Those who cannot bring themselves to consider the first word of ἀγέ-λαος as an imperative, will find that other languages have such compounds with an imperative: forget me not, rendez-vous. We know that ἄγεσι, φέρεσι in ἀγεσί-λαος might be derived from the 3. p. sing. pres. ind., but the verbs in μι do not form their compounds in this manner.

OBSERVATIONS

On the Power of the "Ictus Metricus" in Virgilian Hexameters; embracing some Remarks on Position, Elision, &c. By HENRY W. WILLIAMS, author of "A Critical Investigation of the Versification and Prosodial Usages of the Iliad and Odyssey," &c.

THE expression "Ictus Metricus," or "metrical accent," is used by critics to designate that stress of the voice, comprising both loudness and acuteness, which is laid on particular syllables in the recitation of every verse. Its position is regulated by the nature of the metre, as being Iambic, Trochaic, Anapæstic, Dactylic, &c.; and it is thus that it differs from the prosaic or common accent, which is placed, in prose, on every word, according to its own peculiar character, and not according to its connexion in the sentence. The stress of the voice constituting accent naturally communicates to the syllable on which it rests a particular and characteristic importance; and associated with this stress of the voice is a slight increase of length of utterance, since the accent when resting on a vowel contributes to protract its sound, and when resting on a consonant causes it to reverberate in a greater or less degree. Hence it follows that accent, though in its own nature perfectly distinct from quantity, has a necessary connexion with the length of syllables; and thus, if a syllable be accented, which of itself approximates nearly to a long one, it acquires, in consequence of its reception of the

10 *Observations on the Power of the*

accent, sufficient prominence and force to be considered a long syllable. This is the foundation of the doctrine of the lengthening efficacy of the ictus metricus: a doctrine of the highest importance to the versification both of Homer and of the Attic Tragedians, and of considerable service as it regards the poems of the great Roman, Virgil. Its utility is evident in the annexed lines, among many others, since on no other principle can the metrical usages they exhibit be consistently justified:

Ecl. vi. 53. Ille latus niveum molli fultus hyacintho.

Geor. ii. 5. Muneribus, tibi paupineo gravidus autumnus.

Ibid. 71. Castaneæ fagus, ornusque incanuit albo.

iv. 92. (Nam duo sunt genera) hic melior, insignis et ore.

Æn. i. 651. Pergama cum peteret, inconcessosque Hymenæos.

Ibid. 668. Litora jactetur, odiis Junonis iniquæ.

Æn. ii. 563. Et direpta domus, et parvi casus Iuli.

iii. 504. Atque idem casus, unam faciemus utramque.

It is usual with some to say, that the syllables in question are lengthened in consequence of the cæsural pause; but how a metrical pause made after a syllable can add length or give prominence to that syllable, it is certainly no very easy task to ascertain. We assume then, on the authority of these lines, what indeed, abstractedly considered, is in the highest degree probable, that the ictus metricus has an influence on Virgilian versification; and simply premising that in dactylic verses both the dactyl and the spondee are accented on the first syllable, we proceed to specify those cases in which, we conceive, that influence was allowed by the discriminating judgment of the Roman bard.

The first case to be noticed involves a partial consideration of that important subject to metrical science, *elision*. In his "Institutes of Latin Grammar," Mr. Grant, following the Eton, divides elision into two parts, *Synalæpha* and *Ecthipsis*, which terms he thus defines: "*Synalæpha* cuts off the final vowel or diphthong of a word, when the following word begins with a vowel or diphthong."—"Ecthipsis cuts off the final *m* and the preceding vowel, the following word beginning with a vowel." To this method of treating the subject we most decidedly object, since we consider it not only defective, but to a great extent erroneous. It may be stated as a general rule in Greek prosody, that a final long vowel or diphthong may be made to coalesce with another vowel or diphthong, but cannot be elided unless in cases of peculiar emergency: and when we consider the affinity that subsists between the versification of the Greek and Latin languages, as far as regards Epic poetry,

Ictus Metricus in Virgilian Hexameters. 11

we may naturally expect that some restrictions were made on the elision of a long vowel or diphthong, in that of the latter as well as in that of the former. But what is the fact? Virgil has not once, in the course of his Eclogues, Georgics, and *Æneid*, elided a final long vowel or diphthong before an initial short one, so for the syllable to be short; and we hesitate not to affirm that such an usage is inadmissible in correct hexameters. The general figure, Elision, should, we conceive, be subdivided into the three following particulars: Elision proper, Synalœpha by crasis, and Ecthlipsis, which may be thus distinguished:

Elision proper cuts off a final short vowel before a word beginning with a vowel, either simple or preceded by the letter *h*, causing it to be wholly dropped in pronunciation.

Synalœpha by crasis makes a final vowel or diphthong coalesce with an initial vowel or diphthong, the two invariably forming by their junction a long syllable.

Ecthlipsis cuts off the final *m* and vowel preceding, when the following word begins with a vowel.

Each of these three figures, it is to be observed, contracts the two words into one as far as relates to recitation; and the metrical pauses are consequently to be made as if the two words were one.

But if a final long vowel or diphthong cannot be cut off before another vowel, but only blended with it in pronunciation, it is necessary to affix to it some positive and definitive character in reference to quantity; inasmuch as it must be at the will of the poet whether it shall or shall not coalesce with the succeeding syllable. Nor are we at a loss to assign to it this positive character; for nothing is more probable than that it is equivalent, in respect of quantity, to a long vowel or diphthong similarly situated in Homeric poetry, being by a species of elision too short to constitute of itself a long syllable, but yet much longer than the bulk of short syllables. And hence we derive the first general remark respecting the influence of the *ictus metricus* in Virgilian poetry; viz.

When a final long vowel or diphthong precedes a word beginning with a vowel or the letter *h*, and does not coalesce with the first syllable of that word, it acquires, from the power of the *ictus metricus*, sufficient importance to be considered a long syllable *in arsi*, though it is too short to be so considered in *thesi*.

To substantiate this rule, we here adduce all those verses of Virgil's poems on which it bears; those marked with an asterisk are deserving of particular notice:

12 *Observations on the Power of the*

- Ecl. 11. 24. Amphion Dircaeus in Actæo Aracyntho.
 65. Te Corydon, ð Alexi: trahit sua quemque voluptas.
 111. 6. Et succus pecorī, et lac subducitur agnis.
 63. Munera sunt, laurī, et suave rubens hyacinthus.
 * 79. Et, "longum, formose, vale, valē," inquit, Iola.
 * vi. 44. Clamassent: ut litus, Hylā, Hylā, omne sonaret.
 * vii. 53. Stant et juniperī, et castanæ hirsutæ.
 viii. 41. Ut vidi, ut perī, ut me malus abstulit error.
 44. Ismarus, aut Rhodopē, aut extremi Garamantes.
 108. Credimus? an, quī amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?
 x. 12. Ulla moram fecere, neque Aoniā Aganippe.
- Georg. 1. 221. Ante tibi Eoæ Atlantides abscondantur.
 * 281. Ter sunt conatī imponere Peliō Ossam.
 332. Aut Athō, aut Rhodopen, aut alta Ceraunia telo.
 11. 86. Orchades, et radiī, et amara pausia bacca.
 111. 60. Ætas Lucinam justosque pati Hymenæos.
 155. Arcebis gravido pecorī; armentaque pasces.
 iv. 343. Atque Ephyrē, atque Opis, et Asia Deīopeia.
 461. Implerunt montes: flerunt Rhodopeiæ arces.
- Æn. 1. 16. Posthabita coluisse Samō. Hic illius arma.
 617. Tunc ille Æneas, quem Dardaniō Anchisæ.
 * 111. 74. Nereidum matrī et Neptunō Ægæo.
 211. Insulæ Ionio in magno: quas dira Celæno.
 iv. 235. Quid struit? aut qua spē inimica in gente moratur.
 667. Lamentis gemituque et fœmineō ululatu.
 v. 261. Victor apud rapidum Simoënta sub Iliō alto.
 735. Consilia, Elysiumque colō. Huc casta Sibylla.
 vi. 507. Nomen et arma locum servant. Tē, amice, nequivi.
- vii. 178. Antiqua e cedrō, Italusque, paterque Sabinus.
 226. Submovet Oceanō, et si quem extenta plagarum.
 631. Ardea, Crustumerique, et turrigeræ Antemnæ.
 ix. 291. Hanc sine me spem ferre tuī: audentior ibo.
 477. Evolat infelix, et fœmineō ululatu.
 647. Antiquum in Baten. Hic Dardaniō Anchisæ.
 x. 18. O pater, o hominumque Divumque æterna potestas.
 136. Inclusum buxō, aut Oricia terebintho.
 141. Mæonia genere domō: ubi pinguis culta.
 156. Externo commissa duci. Æneia puppis.
- Æn. xi. 31. Servabat senior, qui Parrhasiō Evaïdro.
 xii. 31. Promissam eripui generō, arma impia sumpsī.

Ictus Metricus in Virgilian Hexameters. 13

Æn. xii. 535. Ille ruenti Hyllō animisque immane frementi.

The second regulation which we have to give, relative to the influence of the ictus metricus on Virgilian poetry, is of equal moment with the one just considered, and, like this, intimately connected with a most important subject to metrical science—we mean *position*. Respecting position, the Eton Grammar has the following remarks: “Vocalis ante duas consonantes, aut duplicem, in eadem dictione, ubique positione longa est. Quod si consonans priorem dictionem claudat, sequente item a consonante inchoante, vocalis præcedens etiam positione longa erit. At si prior dictio in vocalem brevem exeat, sequente a duabus consonantibus incipiente, interdum, sed rarius, producit. Vocalis brevis ante mutam, sequente liquida, communis redditur.” Mr. Grant writes, “A vowel before two consonants, one or both of which are in the same word with it, or before any of the double consonants, *j, x, z*, being likewise in the same word with the vowel, is long by *position*. If the former word ends in a short vowel, the next word beginning with two consonants, or a double consonant (*x* or *z*), the vowel often remains short. A vowel naturally short, followed by a mute and a liquid, both in the following syllable, is common.” These rules are generally adopted among the learned; but several scholars of eminence, among whom may be mentioned Dr. Carey, are of opinion, that no two consonants, or double consonant, at the beginning of a word, can lengthen a preceding final short vowel. They accordingly affirm, that in the following lines, and a vast number of others, in which a short final vowel is lengthened before a mute followed by a liquid, the vowel is lengthened *in itself* by *cæsura*:

Geor. i. 371. Euriquē Zephyrique tonat domus; omnia plenis.

iv. 336. Drymoquē Xanthoque Ligeaque Phyllodoceque.

Æn. iii. 702. Immanisque Getā, fluvii cognomine dicta.

viii. 425. Brontesquē Steropesque et nudus membra Pyracmon.

xii. 443. Antheusquē Mnestheusque ruunt: omnisque relictis.

And that, in the annexed verse,

Æn. ix. 37. Ferte citi ferrum, date telā, scandite muros,
the final *a* in *tela* is made long by the figure diastole, or by pure poetic licence.

In entering on a brief consideration of the general subject, we must observe that the lengthening of a syllable by position ensues from the delay occasioned to the utterance by the occurrence of two unyielding consonants: which delay, however,

only takes place when one or both of the consonants are to be pronounced immediately after the vowel, and not when both are to be separated from it in pronunciation, by an intervening vocal pause. On this principle it is that the first two rules of the Eton Grammar are founded; and, if true, the sentiments of Dr. Carey on the subject of the third rule must also be founded on this principle. To this principle, however, the advocates of these sentiments do not appear to have been sufficiently attentive; and in endeavoring to establish their doctrine, they seem not to have regarded the difference in recitation between poetry and prose. We certainly think that there is no reason why, in pronouncing the first of the above lines, *que* in *Eurique* should be separated from *Zephyrique*; or why, in pronouncing the last, *telu* should not be connected with the initial *s* of *scandite*. That this latter procedure is not of the most elegant kind we readily admit; still it was certainly more allowable than arbitrarily to change the quantity of the last syllable of *tela*; and as to the former, it is an usage the most correct and proper, since according to no consistent theory of reciting hexameter verses can a pause be made in the middle of a foot after so unimportant a word as the particle *que*. The only regulation that can be made relative to the quantity of the syllables referred to must be of a general nature, as follows: "When the vowel is so situated, as to be separated in pronunciation from the succeeding consonants, the syllable is short; and when the vowel is so situated, as to be connected in pronunciation with one or both of the succeeding consonants, the syllable is long."

With regard to the fourth rule of the Eton Grammar, though it is correct as containing a general representation of the fact of the case, yet it is defective as furnishing no explanation of the principles of the usages in question. It may with propriety be subdivided into the two following regulations, the latter of which exhibits the influence of the ictus metricus on Latin prosody in a most important particular:

1. When a syllable formed by a short vowel, followed by a mute and one of the liquids, is so situated as to have a metrical pause made after it, its quantity depends on the vowel being joined to one of the consonants, or separated from both by that pause. So,

Ecl. I. 53. Et fontes sãc,ros frigus captabis opacum.

vi. 54. Illice sub nig,ra pallentes ruminat herbas.

1. 32. Pan primus calamos cera conjungerẽ, plures.

vi. 42. Caucaseasque refert volũ,ces furtumquẽ Promethei.

Ictus Metricus in Virgilian Hexameters. 15

It may be proper to mention here our belief, that a very slight metrical pause was made after every foot in reciting Latin as well as Greek hexameters. See on this subject the first part of the "Critical Investigation of the Versification and Prosodial Usages of the Iliad and Odyssey."

2. When a syllable formed as above is so situated as not to have a metrical pause after it, it is to be considered long or short, according as it does or does not receive the metrical accent; the two consonants, of themselves, requiring little more exertion to be pronounced together than a single consonant requires. So,

Ecl. vii. 36. Si fœturâ gregem suppleverit, aureus esto.

Geor. i. 235. Quam circum extremæ dextra lævaquē trahuntur.
320. Sublime expulsam eruerent: ita turbine nigro.

ii. 217. Quæ tenuem exhalat nebulam, fumosque volûcres.

We have to observe in the third place, relative to the power of the ictus metricus in Virgilian hexameters, that occasionally, in virtue of it, a final short syllable, formed by a short vowel followed by a consonant, occupies the place of a long syllable; as in the verses cited in the beginning of this treatise, and the following:

Ecl. i. 39. Tityrus hinc aberât. Ipsæ te, Tityre, pinus.

x. 69. Omnia vincit amôr: et nos cedamus amori.

Georg. i. 138. Pleiādās, Hyadas, claranique Lycaonis Arcton.

iv. 463. Atque Getæ, atque Hebrûs, atque Actias Orithyia.

Æn. i. 308. Qui teneant, (nam inculta vidēt,) hominesne, feræne.

xii. 883. Te sine, frater, erît. O quæ satis ima dehiscat.

The instances of this usage in Virgil's poems amount in number to more than fifty.

We remark, fourthly, that in three cases a short syllable, formed by a short final vowel before an initial consonant, is put for a long one, in consequence of the lengthening efficacy of the ictus metricus. The verses referred to are,

Æn. iii. 91. Liminaquē, laurusque Dei: totusque moveri.

464. Dona dehinc auro graviâ, sectoque elephanto.

xii. 363. Chloreaquē Sybarimque Daretaque Thersilochumque.

It should appear that this usage is not only of very rare occurrence, but is also restricted to the case when the initial consonant is a liquid, or the letter *s*.

Lastly, the metrical emphasis occasionally enables the first syllable of *rêlīgîō*, *rêlīquîæ*, *rêpêrît*, *rêtûlît*, *quâtûör*, and a few

16. *Zend and Pahlavi Manuscripts.*

others, to stand for the first of a dactyl, as in the subjoined lines,

Geor. 1. 270. Rēligio vetuit, segeti prætendere sepem.

Æn. 1. 30. Troas, rēliquias Danaum atque immitis Achillei.

Geor. 11. 22. Sunt alii, quos ipse via sibi rēperit usus.

Æn. v. 598. Rētulit, et priscos docuit celebrare Latinos.

Geor. 1. 258. Temporibusque parem diversis quātuor annum.

It remains only to observe, that in the last three cases the accent probably rested particularly on the consonant. We have the authority of Mss. for considering that religio, the first syllable receiving the ictus, was uttered, in measure, religio; and in reference to the third and fourth cases mentioned, the fact, that the writers of correct Latin hexameters studied to let the consonant be one of those which most forcibly reverberate in pronounciation when accented, as *r, l, s*, furnishes a strong presumptive evidence in favor of the position we have assumed. And let it be remembered, that in respect of most points of metrical science, great probability is the utmost at which we can arrive by critical deduction: to positive and absolute certainty we are almost entire strangers.

ZEND AND PAHLAVI MANUSCRIPTS.

FROM some of those ingenious correspondents who occasionally diversify the classical pages of your Journal with articles illustrating Eastern literature, I would beg leave to solicit information respecting a large and valuable collection of manuscripts, brought from India above thirty years ago by Mr. Samuel Guise, and announced for sale by private contract. One of the printed catalogues which described this collection is now in my possession. The Arabic and Persian books were numerous, and some among them appear to have been rare and curious; but the Mss. that form the subject of my present inquiry, are those works composed in the ancient dialects of Persia called *Zend* and *Pahlavi*, many of which have been ascribed to authors of very remote antiquity, and some even to *Zerátusht*, or *Zerdusht*, the great Zoroaster himself. Mr. Guise procured those extraordinary writings at Surat, where he resided many years as a physician or surgeon: most of the Zend and Pahlavi manuscripts were purchased at a considerable price from the widow of Daráb, a learned *destour* or priest of the Parsee fire-worshippers, who had some time before instructed the accomplished Frenchman, M. Anquetil du Perron, in the different

dialects used by the ancient Persians, as far as their modern descendants could understand them through the assistance of books and of verbal traditions. Thus informed, M. Anquetil, on his arrival in France, published the "*Zendavesta*," a work of considerable labor and ingenuity, in three quarto volumes; one of which comprises a list of the Mss. collected by himself in India. On a comparison, however, of this list with Mr. Guise's catalogue, it appears that our fellow-countryman was fortunate in obtaining some works which the French Orientalist had been unable to procure. Now the object of my inquiry is to ascertain whether Mr. Guise's collection has been purchased for one of our universities or other public institutions, or by some private individual of this country; whether it has found a place in any continental library, or whether it still continues unsold, and, in this case, how an application for the purchase of it should be made.

I am aware that many doubts have been entertained respecting the age and authenticity of those Zend and Pahlavi compositions; and a work lately printed at Bombay from a manuscript supposed by some to be a genuine specimen of the ancient Persic language, has been condemned as spurious by able critics, or regarded as a modern fabrication. That the learned Dr. Hyde of Oxford, who, about one hundred and thirty years ago, published his elaborate treatise "*De Religione Veterum Persarum*," expected some important results from a knowledge of the old Persian language, is evident, not only from the time and labor which he devoted to the study of it, but from the expense incurred in causing a font of metal types to be very handsomely and accurately cut in imitation of the Zend and Pahlavi characters. Whether these metal types are still preserved at Oxford, or were removed several years ago, as I have heard, to the British Museum, is another circumstance on which information would be highly acceptable.

But the exertions of Dr. Hyde, however laborious, have not in any considerable degree facilitated our acquiring a knowledge of the ancient Persic dialects: in his time England possessed but few Zend or Pahlavi Mss., and he wanted the assistance of vocabularies or dictionaries. It was reserved for M. Anquetil du Perron to furnish ample and curious specimens of those dialects, which have for some centuries been considered by the Parsee fire-worshippers as genuine remains of the language used in Persia, not only while the Sassanidan monarchs governed that empire, but during the age of Darius, and, as I before remarked, of Zoroaster himself. The Mss. brought to France by M. Anquetil, and now preserved in Paris, if they were collated with those brought to England by Mr. Guise, would furnish materials for some interesting works which might be printed in the types cut under Dr. Hyde's inspection. Our public libraries contain a few volumes of this rare class, and others are deposited in the private collections

of individuals who have lately returned from the East. Sir Wm. Ouseley mentions (in the account of his travels) that he procured several Zend and Pahlavi works from the fire-worshippers or Parsees of Bombay, and from their brethren of the same religion, the Gabrs, in Persia; and among those manuscripts perhaps the most curious are two or three vocabularies of the ancient dialects, written in the Zend, Pázend and Pahlavi characters, and explained in the modern Persian. Such works we may justly regard as literary treasures; and in this department they should certainly be the first selected for publication. Without some lexicographical assistance the knowledge of various characters must prove an acquisition rather tantalizing than useful. The engraved tables given by Anquetil du Perron in his "*Zendavesta*," would in a few days enable any person to acquire a sufficient acquaintance with the Zend and Pahlavi alphabets; but his vocabularies are brief and imperfect, the words being expressed in our common French or English letters, as he wanted types capable of representing them in their original and proper characters. To remedy such a defect, the metal types of Dr. Hyde might be successfully employed in printing those vocabularies above mentioned, with the explanations in modern Persian, English, or Latin, and some philological notes. Assisted by a manual of this kind, our Orientalists would easily ascertain whether the Zend and Pahlavi Mss. that have not yet been examined are more worthy of translation than those which afforded to Anquetil du Perron the materials for his *Zendavesta*: a work abounding with information respecting the religious opinions, rites, ceremonies, liturgies, and prayers of the modern Parsees, or fire-worshippers; but still leaving much of historical, geographical and antiquarian matter (subjects more generally interesting) to be sought in other Zend and Pahlavi writings with which we are hitherto unacquainted.

I had written so far, and was preparing to offer this article for insertion in the *Classical Journal*, when an odd coincidence induced me to protract it, and gratified me at the same time by showing that ancient Persic literature is not wholly neglected, as I had begun to apprehend. From an ingenious member of the Royal Asiatic Society, Mr. Huttman, I received a roll very neatly and accurately lithographed, in length about six feet and a half, and in width nearly fifteen inches; it is printed on different sheets pasted together, and consists of twelve compartments: the first describing what the others contain, with some useful and interesting observations on the *Zund* and *Puhluwee* characters, as those names are generally written by Englishmen who have learned Persian in Hindústan, although Sir Wm. Jones expressed the same words by *Zend* and *Pahlavi*, much more in conformity with the true pronunciation of Shiráz and Isfahán, as I have been assured by gentlemen who resided many years in Persia, and were inti-

mately acquainted with some of the Gabrs or fire-worshippers of Yezd and other places. According to the same corrupt system of pronunciation, a book which native Persians would call *Sad-der*, (or *Sad-dar*, the *a* in *dar* being short,) is here written *Sud-dur*: this name signifies "the hundred gates." The first compartment of the roll is not numbered: that marked No. 1. exhibits an extract from the book *Sad-der*, the Goozuratee translation incorporated with the original Zend, each in its proper character, the language being Persian. No. 2. The original text without the Goozuratee; Zend character. No. 3. The same text translated into Zend and Pahlavi, with the modern Persian underwritten. No. 4. A Sanscrit translation. No. 5. Persian text of No. 2. No. 6. Goozuratee (Jutee) translation of No. 2. in the language of Malwa. No. 7. Modern Goozuratee translation. No. 8. The first section or chapter of the *Sadder* in its poetical version. No. 9. Dr. Hyde's Latin translation of No. 8. No. 10. The text No. 1. language Persian, in Zend and Pahlavi characters, "to show the different modes of orthography and of employing the same or cognate letters," &c. No. 11. The Persian, Pahlavi and Zend alphabets. Now, however useful these specimens may be to those who study the different characters exhibited in this roll, we must regret that the labor and ingenuity employed on them have not been expended on some more interesting subject than the *Sadder*: a most contemptible work, of which Dr. Hyde (in his "*Religio Veterum Persarum*") has given a Latin translation, and which, after all, are (as Mr. Richardson says in the Dissertation prefixed to his Arabic and Persian Dictionary,) nothing more than "the wretched rhymes of a modern Parsi destour (priest) who lived about three centuries ago." To our best thanks, however, the gentleman is fully entitled, under whose direction and at whose expense these specimens have been executed—Mr. Romer, lately chief at Surat, now member of council at Bombay: and I am persuaded that if his researches among the fire-worshippers or Parsees had been successful, he would have favored us with specimens of Zend and Pahlavi works more interesting and more useful (such as the vocabularies above mentioned) than the *Sadder* with its "*hundred gates*."

P. Q.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE TRUTH OF HISTORY.

No. II.—[Continued from No. LXXVI.]

“Oh sir, I pray you tell me of curtesie, have you heard any thing of the news, that you so much inquired for in your countrey?”—*Spenser's View of the State of Ireland.* Vol. viii. p. 398. of *Todd's edition of Spenser.*

HERODOTUS.

TO those who may have read my former article, little apology will be necessary for postponing the intended remarks on the Pelasgi,¹ till we have endeavored to ascertain what degree of credit is due to the history of Herodotus. For whether Bellerophon be Nebuchadnezzar or not, Herodotus ought not to be confounded with Homer; and he who asserts that Nebuchadnezzar must have found a place in poetry, is bound to admit that the conqueror found a place in history also; and if we reject Labyrinthus the peace-maker as his representative, we must do our best to identify him with Cambyzes the madman. But how will this agree with the credit of “the Father and Prince of History?” the author whom Mitford so often and so highly praises:² “the honest histo-

¹ Τὸ Πηλασγικὸν ἄργον ἄμεινον. What is Pelasgic, had better be let alone: an oracular answer which will not frighten me from resuming the subject, but which seems to show that the Pythia was not ignorant of the prophecy, which declared that the Ammonites should be driven out every man right forth, and that none should gather up him that wandered. In one respect, however, I have fulfilled the oracle; for some words, which should have been inserted in the text to identify the vagabond and fortune-telling gypsies with the Pelasgi, have by an unlucky blunder been applied to the Carians and Chaldeans.

² Moses, David, Solomon, and Nebuchadnezzar, will be found to have acted many parts in the heathen drama. Nebuchadnezzar may be recognised not only in the Bellerophon, who attempted to fly up to heaven, and the Sesostris, who became blind and destroyed himself; but also in Lycaon, Midas, and Cambyzes, and in the serpent who destroyed the companions of Cadmus; in the serpent Python, whose death caused so much rejoicing; and in the monster Typhon, who murdered Osiris and dispersed his limbs; i. e. who ravaged Egypt, and scattered the Egyptians. Perhaps the wildest, and at the same time the truest, story is that of the Argonauts: the wildest, because the Prophet Elijah is turned into the sorceress Medea; the truest, because the Argonauts may really be said to have *fetched back* the golden fleece, when by plundering Jehoram they repaid themselves for the bond-service which Laomedon,

An Inquiry into the Truth of History. 21

rian of the age," whose "usual simplicity,"² "simple honesty,"³ "scrupulous honesty and modesty,"⁴ and "honest scruple,"⁵ are duly noticed, and whose "place in ancient history can be supplied by no other author:"⁶ who, as Larcher tells us, "*ne s'est proposé d'autre but que la vérité*;"⁷ and who, in the same author's opinion, is very much to be esteemed for "*l'exactitude de ses recherches*:"⁸ whose inquiries were not confined to his own country, but who visited Tyre and Egypt for the sake of correct information.

Undoubtedly we must make very free with the credit of the Father and Prince of History; but in this we shall only follow the example of Mitford himself, whose insertions, omissions, and alterations sufficiently prove that Herodotus is not to be relied on.

"Mr. Richardson,"⁹ says Mitford, "has observed that the revenue of Persia, according to Herodotus's account, was very unequal to the expenses of such an expedition as that attributed to Xerxes." Mitford does not dispute the fact, but he excuses Herodotus, without perceiving, or at least without acknowledging, that Herodotus himself ought to have guarded against an observation so unfavorable to his judgment; and that if no satisfactory account is given of the ways and means of the great king, a still stronger objection arises from our very defective information as to the ways and means of the European Greeks, not to say from the impossibility of reconciling the unavoidable expenses of their warfare with their poverty.

If the principal circumstances of the expedition fell necessarily under the eyes of thousands, had not Herodotus sufficient means

i. e. Solomon, had laid on them, and probably regained what David had taken from them. Should the reader wish to trace the original of the war of Thebes, he has only to put the alliance with Egypt for the deliverance from the Sphinx; Zedekiah for Ædipus; and Coniah, who had the burial of an ass, for Polynices: the prophetic and weeping Jeremiah will explain the story of that Teiresias who was turned into a woman, and whose daughter dissolved into a flood of tears. The Harpies are said to have been locusts; but the locusts are so far from polluting what they leave, that they eat up every thing eatable, and so far from being filthy, that afterwards they are eaten themselves. The original Harpies, the sons of Eli, did pollute what they touched; and the famine, which Virgil's Cælæno is made to predict, was fulfilled literally in those who begged for a morsel of bread. My explanations may have seemed strange; it will be stranger still to believe what we read of the Argonauts, the Sphinx, &c. &c.

¹ P. 126. vol. 2.

² P. 16. vol. 2.

³ P. 118. vol. 2.

⁴ P. 199. vol. 2.

⁵ P. 38. vol. 2.

⁶ P. 39. vol. 2. I have used the third octavo edition.

⁷ Preface, p. ii. It is amusing to compare Larcher's praise of Herodotus with his censure of Bruce.

⁸ Vie, p. lxxiii.

⁹ P. 32. vol. 2, note.

of ascertaining that a mare did not bring forth a hare ; and instead of blaming Xerxes for not attending to prodigies which never could have happened, ought we not to blame those who trust an historian who can relate and believe absurdities? If even after the victory of Salamis the Greeks refused to advance from Ægina to Chios, and were with difficulty prevailed on to advance as far as Delos ; if Herodotus accounts for this unwillingness by alleging the inexperience of the Greeks, and their belief that Samos was as far distant as the pillars of Hercules ;¹ should not this acknowledgement have awakened suspicion in the mind of the English historian, and made him doubt whether "a territory on the Asiatic shore, 400 miles in length, eminent for richness of soil and beauty of climate," was in reality colonised by adventurers from those nations which had gained so little knowledge of that territory?

If "the reader should cast his eye on the map, and see there what Ægina is," should not Mr. Mitford himself have learnt from a similar inspection that the merchant-pirates of that barren rock could not have made the exertions which Herodotus has inscribed to them? If the confederate army at Platæa was more than half composed of slaves, should not Mr. Mitford have asked himself what could have induced these slaves to fight against the Persians, and how 5000 of the Spartan citizens of the most cruel of all slave-owners could have been safe when supported by 35,000 Helots?

"Never was human nature degraded by system to such a degree as in the miserable Helots. Every possible method was taken to set them at the widest distance from their haughty masters."² How fit were these to be companions in arms!

Thucydides mentions that more than 20,000 Athenian slaves revolted to the Lacedæmonians³ in the Peloponnesian war ; yet the Lacedæmonians were noted for their inhumanity ; and in the time of Xenophon the Athenian slaves seem to have enjoyed some little degree of comfort, for Xenophon⁴ complains of their sauciness, and sauciness is not the vice of the oppressed and miserable. If, therefore, the slaves revolted from the Athenians to the Lacedæmonians, may we not infer that if 35,000 Helots had found themselves armed, disciplined and united at Platæa, they would have thought of something else than fighting for their taskmasters? The slaves of the Argives had already set them an example of rebellion ; and though that rebellion was at last crushed, the issue would not have discouraged the Helots in their present circumstances.

¹ Book viii. c. 132.

² Book vii. c. 27.

³ History of Greece, vol. i. p. 334.

⁴ De Rep. Ath. lib. i. c. 10.

Thucydides tells us, that the Helots who fought under Brasidas were rewarded with their liberty on their return.¹ Liberty was promised to those who should succeed in conveying provisions to the blockaded Spartans; and as we are not told that the Helots who fought under Brasidas distinguished themselves particularly, may we not conclude that their liberty was given them in consequence of a previous promise? The conclusion will be authorised by Thucydides, who tells us, that before these Helots set out, 2000 of their countrymen had been crowned and paraded about as freemen. Now what was the number of the Helots who set out with these hopes, under the command of the able and popular Brasidas? They were but 700;² and yet the Spartans could not trust even this small number with Brasidas, till they had secretly made away with the 2000, whom they had publicly honored and paraded about as freemen. Herodotus, however, is not fastidious. Helots remained to perish with Leonidas at Thermopylæ; but the circumstance is noticed incidentally only: 40,000 Helots fought at Platæa, but those who fell were not honored with the same burial as their haughty masters; neither are any of the survivors said to have been released from their slavery.

"C'est la soupe qui fait le soldat." The Lacedæmonian black broth was not famed for its invigorating qualities; but on military service "many indulgences were allowed, insomuch that the camp was to the Lacedæmonians the scene of ease and luxury."³ Undoubtedly, the means of ease and luxury may be procured by iron; but were they ever purchased by iron money? Such, however, is said to have been the money of the Lacedæmonians; and we may learn from Polybius,⁴ if common sense should not be thought sufficient authority, that the iron coin of Sparta bore no premium abroad. Shall we obviate this financial difficulty, by presuming that the Lacedæmonians were subsidized by the Athenians, or that they took sufficient provisions with them, or that they found supplies in the neighbourhood of Platæa?

¹ Lib. v. c. 34.

² According to Mitford, these 700 were not slaves. "After this shocking and dastardly precaution," [the murder of the 2000 Helots,] "the Spartan ministry less scrupled to send a part of their force on a foreign expedition. Still, however, they would allow no more than 700 Lacedæmonians," &c. Vol. iii. p. 293. In his note he gives his reason for thinking that Thucydides meant to be so understood.

³ Mitford, vol. i. p. 327.

⁴ The iron money of Sparta would form an interesting subject for the political economist; and we shall be much obliged to the antiquary who would give us some account of the different coins. According to Polybius, (lib. vi. c. 49, 50.) iron money and barter could not provide for the wants of the Spartans in their maritime expeditions, or in the wars which they carried on beyond the limits of Peloponnesus.

As the Eubœans had been obliged to purchase the continuance of the allied fleet at Artemisium,¹ and as the Spartans in advancing from Peloponnesus would not only leave their intrenchments, and march against a very superior enemy, but also leave some enemies behind them, they might fairly have stipulated for a subsidy from the Athenians. Herodotus, however, mentions no such circumstance, and the Athenians had no money to spare. Athens was not a commercial state, neither was Attica a fertile country. We are told that the ships had been built with the produce of the silver mines of Laureium; but whatever was the richness of those mines, they had probably ceased to be worked after the battle of Thermopylæ, and the advance of Xerxes. An invading enemy may sometimes contrive to make war support war, but the system failed even in Bonaparte's hands; and although the severe privations and sufferings of the Spanish guerrillas prove that patriotism will endure all the hardships of a defensive warfare, yet few will assert that Spain carried on her war without the aid of money, and that in point of expense it signified not whether the Spanish peasant was employed in war or in husbandry.

The expedition to Tempe,² therefore, and the sudden retreat from it; the subsequent advance to Artemisium, the sea-fight there, and afterwards at Salamis; the expedition to Samos, and the furnishing of 8000 men at arms and 8000 slaves for the ensuing campaign in Bœotia, would of themselves have caused very heavy expenses to the Athenian citizens: but in addition to these they had to bear all the expenses arising from the removal of their families, not only at the present time, but in the last year also. The slave population was numerous; and its labor could have produced but little, whether at Salamis, or Ægina, or Trœzene. Attica was

¹ Themistocles told the Eubœans that though words could not persuade, gold might; and for thirty talents, something more than seven thousand pounds sterling, he would engage that the fleet should remain and fight the Persians. The money was presently paid into his hands. Mitford, vol. ii. p. 168. The sequel shows that the Eubœans made a dear bargain; but they could well afford it, if they had so much ready money at such a time.

² Themistocles was one of the two commanders; it should follow that the Athenians furnished a considerable part of the forces, or defrayed a very considerable part of the expense: for we are told that it was necessary to give the command of the combined fleet to a Lacedæmonian, though the Athenians contributed no less than 127 ships. If we suppose that Themistocles was joined in command merely on account of his great abilities, we must remember that Themistocles is not said to have held command either at Platæa or Mycale, although his great abilities had been made so manifest in the events which followed the expedition to Tempe.

now again in the possession of the Persians ; and those hosts, which had drunk up rivers, had probably exhausted all the provisions that Attica could furnish in their first visit.

If, therefore, money was to be advanced to the Spartans, the Athenian citizens had not the means of advancing it. The public revenue of Athens may have been increased by the fine, which was imposed on Miltiades and exacted from his son. It is to be hoped, however, that the poverty and not the will of Athens consented to this act of ingratitude and meanness; and as we are told that the ships were built by means of that revenue, which under other circumstances would have been distributed among the people, we may infer that even in peace the state-exchequer had not been overstocked. At present all the offices of government must have been in confusion, for the Athenians were again outcasts from their native country. Themistocles was not the most disinterested of mortals ; and at a period not much later, the Athenian magistrates seem to have been strongly suspected of peculation.¹ At this time, therefore, when the Athenians had no homes but in their ships,² the public treasury, if not quite empty, could scarcely have contained any thing more than was absolutely necessary for the Athenians themselves. If these remarks have any truth in them, it will be allowed that the Athenians did not subsidize the Lacedæmonians, and the silence of Herodotus is easily accounted for. Indeed, the Athenians themselves would not have failed to mention so important a circumstance, when they upbraided the Lacedæmonians for opposing the rebuilding of their walls.

Shall we adopt the third supposition ? Shall we assert that the Lacedæmonians contrived to draw their supplies from the neighborhood of Plataea ? There are strong objections to such a supposition. "The Lacedæmonians were joined at the Isthmus by the other Peloponnesians of the confederacy."³—"At Eleusis the combined army was joined by the Athenian forces :"—"the army proceeded into Bœotia, and took a position on the roots of Mount Cithæron, opposite to the camp of the Persians, the river Asopus

¹ In the *Anabasis*, Cheirosophus and Xenophon rally each other on the proficiency of their respective nations in stealing. Demosthenes mentions treasurers, by whom the Opisthodomos or treasury was burnt. Potter, referring to Demosthenes and the Scholiast, tells us that these treasurers having embezzled the public money, secured themselves by that means, and prevented the city from calling them to account. This is no reason for thinking that the public accounts were properly kept during the invasion.

² See the observation of Adeimantus, and the answer of Themistocles. (Herod. lib. viii. c. 61.) They relate to the first abandonment of Attica, but they suit the second also.

³ Mitford, vol. ii. p. 225, &c.

flowing between them.”¹ In such a situation, and while the Persian wealth must have commanded the market, and the Persian cavalry commanded the country, even a Grecian army could scarcely have foraged with success or safety; and their numbers, for they are said to have amounted to 110,000 men, would very soon have exhausted all that could be supplied by the friendly districts of Megaris and Platæa: if, indeed, these districts had suffered so little from the war as to be able to provision their own troops, amounting to 6000 from Megaris, and 1200 from Platæa. Not to mention 1000 Lacedæmonians, whom Herodotus places at Megara immediately after the retreat of Mardonius from Attica.

Shall we therefore adopt the second supposition, as the least improbable, and conclude that the Spartans took all necessary supplies with them? As each Spartan was attended by seven Helots, there would be ample means of conveyance; but as these Helots were to fight, we must allow that they were also to be fed: so that our difficulties are not diminished by the great number of the slaves.

Laconia might be called an exporting country; for “the exchange of the superfluous produce of the earth against useful foreign commodities was permitted by Lycurgus,”² and seems indeed to have been the only means of procuring such commodities; but the exercise of husbandry and of the mechanical arts was forbidden to the free Lacedæmonians, and committed to the slaves alone. And we may learn from Adam Smith,³ that in the manufactures carried on by slaves, more labor must generally have been employed to execute the same quantity of work than in those carried on by freemen; and the same judicious author tells us, “the experience of all ages and nations, I believe, demonstrates that the work done by slaves, though it appears to cost only their maintenance, is in the end the dearest of any.” A person who can acquire no property, can have no other interest but to eat as much and to labor as little as possible. Whatever work he does beyond what is sufficient to purchase his own maintenance, can be squeezed out of him by violence only, and not by any interest of his own. In ancient Italy, how much the cultivation of corn degenerated, how unprofitable it became to the master, when it fell under the management

¹ Lib. ix. c. 14. Mitford does not notice “this other army” of Herodotus, and the story gains by the omission. But should not Mitford have followed his author more closely, after praising him so highly?

Whoso shall telle a tale after a man,
He moste reherse, as neighe as ever he can,
Everich word, if it be in his charge,
All speke he never so rudely and so large.

² Mitford, vol. i. p. 317.

³ Wealth of Nations, 3rd vol.

of slaves, is remarked by both Pliny and Columella. In the time of Aristotle it had not been much better in ancient Greece. Speaking of the ideal republic, described in the laws of Plato, to maintain 5000 idle men (the number of warriors supposed necessary for its defence), together with their women and servants, would require, he says, a territory of boundless extent and fertility, like the plains of Babylon.¹

This being the case, the husbandry which was practised in Laconia would raise but little produce that could be called superfluous, and that little would hardly suffice to barter for such articles as were necessary in warfare, and were either not manufactured at home, or manufactured very badly and in small quantities. At the beginning of summer, therefore, and at the close of a great festival, neither meal nor corn would be very abundant at Sparta. Animal food, perhaps, might be plentiful; for at the Hyacinthia and Carneia the Lacedæmonians would probably have offered animals in sacrifice, instead of substituting those cheaper offerings, which their law allowed and their poverty excused. But even thus our difficulties will not be removed.

Xenophon² remarks, that expeditions by land were subject to inconveniences in the commissariat department; and they who may be inclined to think that Sparta could furnish the means of provisioning these 40,000 men, will admit that in summer time some care and precaution must be used to hinder the provisions from being spoiled in the conveyance. Was there leisure for such care and precaution?

The ephori,³ after hearing the advice of Chilaus, immediately, without saying any thing to the deputies, while it was yet night, sent out 5000 Spartiates, and seven Helots with each of them. When it was day, the deputies, who knew nothing of the departure, came before the ephori, and in answer to their reproaches were informed, to their great surprise, that the army sent against the Persians had probably reached Oresteum⁴ by that time.

We have lately been informed that facts are the dross of history. Had they been called the ore of history, the observation would have been less startling; but whether the facts just related are dross or ore, they require some attention. In the first place, they show that the resolution of the ephori was sudden; in the next place, they show that this sudden resolution was put in practice with great suddenness and great secrecy; and in the third

¹ Wealth of Nations, 2nd vol.

² De Rep. Athen. c. 2. s. 5.

³ Herod. lib. ix. c. 11.

⁴ Oresteum, according to Larcher, is "à cinq ou six lieues au nord-ouest de Sparte."

place, they will show that the measure itself was one which it was very difficult, not to say impossible, to execute with either suddenness or secrecy.

That the resolution was sudden might be proved, if further proof were wanted, from the language with which the deputies from Athens, Megaris and Plataea, addressed the ephori on the next morning: "You, O Lacedæmonians, remaining here at home, celebrate the Hyacinthia, and amuse yourselves;" and from their having formed a determination to return home: but let us attend to the suddenness of the execution. A summer's night is not long; and as the deputies had a long journey to take, they probably were early in their attendance on the morrow: yet by that time the troops were presumed to have reached Oresteum. Forty thousand men had been collected and equipped, and had already marched some distance before the deputies were aware that the resolution had been formed.

The relation of Herodotus is very brief; but how much is comprised in it! Thucydides describes two expeditions, the one close following the other, in which the Lacedæmonians, who in his opinion were apt to be dilatory, exerted themselves with vigor. Both of these expeditions were against the Argives; and in the latter of the two, the Lacedæmonians sent back the sixth part of their army for the protection of Sparta. This sixth part consisted of the young and old; and this circumstance, coupled with the terms in which Thucydides describes the setting-out of the expedition, may convince us that the whole disposable force of Laconia was employed on this occasion. There were 7 lochi, 700 skiritæ, and 300 cavalry. Each lochus contained about 512 men; so that the Lacedæmonian troops amounted to 4584 men.¹ Their object was the protection of Tegea, and they halted at Oresteum; and Thucydides declares that in this expedition they used unexampled celerity. Yet the troops employed on this occasion were in all probability the same as those which had just returned from the expedition against the same Argives. The Lacedæmonians had been for some time at war; and in this army the proportion of those who had no command being comparatively very small, as Mitford has observed, subordination must have been maintained without difficulty. If, therefore, the 5000 Spartiates, who set out against the Persians, had used merely the same diligence as those who marched to the relief of Tegea, we might have been well satisfied, considering the silence and secrecy which were observed, and the suddenness of the summons to those who were celebrating the Hyacinthia and amusing themselves. But how was the usual discipline and marshalling to be observed, when each Spartiate was to take with him

¹ Lib. v.

seven Helots? How much time must have been occupied in assembling from their various drudgery 35,000 of those wretched slaves, whose nature was degraded by system, and for whom no vile office was thought too vile? How much caution must have been necessary in giving arms to those who had suffered every kind of provocation, and whom it was necessary to watch with a cruel jealousy? Let us be content with inferring, that if an army so collected and so suddenly despatched took with them sufficient provisions for three days, they took with them the utmost that their numbers and their sudden departure allowed.

Shall we suppose that provisions were forwarded soon after their departure? Herodotus says nothing of such a measure. "The deputies, having learnt to their great surprise that these 40,000 men were on their march to the Isthmus, set out after them as quickly as possible; and a body of 5000 Lacedæmonians, selected out of the Perioeci, or out of those who dwelt round Sparta, accompanied them." At the battle of Platæa these 5000 Lacedæmonians were attended by 5000 light-armed slaves; and as we cannot imagine that these 5000 slaves would have been trusted by themselves, however eager they may have been to fight for the freedom and glory of their oppressors, we must conclude that the slaves set out with the Lacedæmonians, and consequently that very great despatch was used on this occasion also: for, according to Herodotus, the deputies set off as quickly as possible, and the Lacedæmonians accompanied them.¹

One and but one more supposition can be indulged, unless we exalt the heroes of Herodotus above the heroes of Homer, and assert that Pausanias and his troops preferred fighting on empty stomachs.² We must suppose that the necessary supplies were drawn from the Isthmus and its neighborhood. This supposition will be authorised by Herodotus, who states that near Cithæron the Persian cavalry surprised a convoy of 500 beasts of burden, which were carrying provisions from Peloponnesus to the Grecian camp;³ and who states afterwards, that the Grecian attend-

¹ τὴν ταχίστην. The route through Argolis seems to have been the shortest, either as to distance or as to time; but as the Argives had promised Mardonius to intercept the Spartan forces, we may conclude that this second expedition took the same route as the first, and make τὴν ταχίστην refer not to the shortest road, but to the despatch used by the deputies.

² "But now, ye warriors, take a short repast;

And well-refreshed to bloody combat haste.

Pope's *Iliad*, 2d book, v. 451.

The shortness of the repast and the haste are not in the original.

³ ἡποζύγια. "They killed men and cattle till sated with slaughter, and drove the remainder to their own camp." Mitford. Many convoys were intercepted in the late wars; but we may question whether the

ants,¹ who had been sent for provisions into Peloponnesus, were prevented from returning by the Persian cavalry. If, therefore, the Greek army was provisioned from Peloponnesus after it had marched into Bœotia, we may reasonably infer that it was provisioned from the same source, while it yet remained within the Isthmus.

Have we then got rid of our difficulties at last? Have we reconciled Herodotus and Mitford with probability, and may we end this tedious inquiry? Unluckily we have made no nearer approach to truth than was made by the youthful students who rejected the fables of Æsop in favor of the exploits of Thomas Hickathrift.

In the first place, Peloponnesus could hardly be called a corn country. Very little of Arcadia, its largest province, was in a state of tillage; and Messenia, its most fertile province, was cultivated by the wretched Helots. In the preceding year, corn had been imported from Pontus: the many myriads² who began to fortify the Isthmus after the battle of Thermopylæ, were lost to their respective countries as agriculturists. The combined fleet, when assembled off the Isthmus, must have drawn supplies from Peloponnesus; and the confederates who assembled at the Isthmus after the battle of Salamis, and the necessary consumption of the ensuing winter and spring, would have emptied granaries better stocked than those of Peloponnesus.

In the beginning of summer how was an army so suddenly collected and so suddenly despatched, and amounting to 50,000 men at least, to find the necessary supplies on its arrival at the Isthmus? In the time of Demosthenes the agriculturists of Peloponnesus had more leisure, and could scarcely have less skill than

captors ever slaughtered the beeves, which they had the means of driving off to their own quarters. The cattle here mentioned seem to have been used merely as beasts of burden; and the meaning of *στρά* may be restricted to bread, without doing violence to the Greek language or Greek habits. "*Σίτρος*, the general term, means bread, as bread with us is the general term for food. There are many instances of the Greeks considering the want of bread as famine; and a very particular one in Roman history. At Avaricum Cæsar's troops had plenty of meat, but no bread; and this was considered by him as a sufficient reason to offer to his army a proposal for quitting the siege." Vincent's Nearchus, p. 230, 2nd edition. *στρά, τὰ*. *Cibaria, Cibi, præsertim farinacei.* *Σίτρος, οὐ, δ*, 1. *Frumentum.* 2. *Cibus quilibet, præsertim farinaceus.* Schweighæuser, Lex. Herodot. How the 500 beasts passed the wall and mound of the Isthmus remains to be explained.

¹ *Ὀπίωτες*. According to Schweighæuser's Lexicon, *Famuli armigeri, Peditesque*. That these men are not the same as those who accompanied the convoy is very evident: neither can they be the 1000 Lacedæmonians whom we left at Megara, nor a detachment of the slaves. Who then were they, and what were their numbers?

² Herodotus, lib. viii. c. 71. They all worked day and night.

those of former days ; yet even then Attica drew its chief supplies from Pontus. Peloponnesus is not mentioned as sending corn to a market so ready and so near.¹ Is it not enough to suppose that 110,000 Greeks, when assembled in Bœotia, drew their supplies from Peloponnesus by means which any other nation would have found inadequate, without supposing also that the moneyless 50,000 troops of Sparta were, without delay, provisioned from the neighborhood of the Isthmus? That they were supplied from its neighborhood, if they were supplied at all, seems clear from what is now passing before our eyes. The high price of corn in England is drawing corn from the inland parts of Spain ; and the blockade of the Dardanelles has obliged the Turks to get corn by land-carriage. The harvest in Spain has been abundant, and the price of corn is very low in the inland parts ; but the expense of land-carriage will be very great, and the corn very dear to us : the expense will be very great in Turkey also.

In defiance of our own experience, shall we maintain that the Peloponnesians exerted themselves to collect corn for those who had no money to pay for it ?

It is true that in his first expedition Don Quixote thought that knight-errants were to travel scot-free ; but he was convinced by the reasoning of the inn-keeper, and provided himself with money when he next sallied forth. We have allowed the Lacedæmonians to march to Tempe and back, and to maintain a navy without any visible means of defraying the expense : let us be content with this romancing, lest in our liberality to the Lacedæmonians we should starve the Athenians, who, crowded as they are in the little isle of Salamis, and driven a second time from their own country, must also procure their supplies from Peloponnesus.

Herodotus is consistent in his extravagance : there is so far method in his madness, that a campaign which began with wonders is continued and finished in like manner. "Mardonius," says Mitford, "seems to have been naturally disposed to extraordinary things." His conduct on the present occasion was indeed most extraordinary. As the son-in-law of the warlike Darius, and as commander of the army which subdued the Brygian Thracians,

¹ "For you well know that of all places we are the most dependent on foreign supplies of corn. Now the corn which is imported from Pontus equals, or rather exceeds in quantity, all that comes to us from other markets." Demosthenes against Leptines. The translation is taken from the *Museum Criticum*.—"Some ships, carrying corn from the Euxine for Ægina and Peloponnesus, were stopped by the Persian officers in the Hellespont. Xerxes directed that they should be suffered to proceed on their voyage: 'For,' said he, 'we are going to the same country, and the corn may be useful to us.'" Mitford from Herodotus, lib. vii. c. 147.

32 *An Inquiry into the Truth of History.*

and as brother-in-law to the monarch who subdued Egypt, Mardonius must have acquired some little experience before the battle of Marathon; and the loss of that battle, and the defence of Thermopylæ, would have taught the most prejudiced and ignorant Persians the length of the Grecian spears;¹ although Hippias and Demaratus should have forgotten to notice a circumstance on which so much depended. The Persians² readily adopted the institutions of other nations; shall we maintain that they were backward in this instance? Can we reasonably doubt that Mardonius, who had now passed ten months in Greece—who had selected his 300,000 men from the armed multitudes of Xerxes—who was well supplied with money—who had 50,000 Greek allies, and who was to retrieve the honor of the Persian arms, was as eager for battle now as he showed himself at Platæa, when he challenged the Lacedæmonians to let the business be decided by an engagement not between the two armies, but between the Lacedæmonians and Persians, and when he at last attacked the Greeks against the advice and without the co-operation of Artabazus? But there is a difference between Mardonius at Platæa and Mardonius at Athens.

¹ "At dinner," said Madame Geoffrin, "one should use long knives and short stories." Had Herodotus given the Persians long spears, his stories would have been shortened.

² Herodotus, lib. i. c. 135.

LETTERS
TO
MR. ARCHDEACON TRAVIS,
IN ANSWER TO HIS
DEFENCE
OF THE
THREE HEAVENLY WITNESSES,

1 JOHN v. 7.

BY R. PORSON.

LONDON:—1790.

LETTER XI.

Of the later Latin writers that are quoted in favor of the verse.

Sir,

Augustine and Jerome you have thought fit to number in your own party. "Thus like an experienced officer, by a false muster-roll of authorities, you gain the pay and credit of forces you cannot produce."¹ Let us therefore examine your claim to these testimonies. Augustine says of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "They are one," "These three are one," which words, according to you, bespeak their derivation from this verse too clearly to require any comment. They would have been too clear to require any, if you had first quoted the passage from his treatise against Maximin, where he explains the spirit, the water, and the blood, into an allegory signifying the three persons of the Trinity. "If we examine," says he, "how this passage ought to be interpreted, it will not be absurd to expound it of the Trinity, of which it may be truly said, 'There are three that bear witness,' and, 'the three are one.'" If you had first produced this sentence, the reader would have seen, that when Augustine elsewhere says of the Trinity, "These three are one," even allowing that the phrase is borrowed from scripture, it is only his own exposition of the eighth verse. Could Augustine, writing on the Trinity, and quoting the very next verse to the seventh, be ignorant of it, if it were then commonly known, or refrain from using it in some part or other of his treatise? You will not object that Augustine might think the word *unus* signified unity of consent, not of

¹ Middleton, Farther Remarks on Bentley, vol. iii. p. 456.

essence, 1. because you affirm that he has twice quoted the seventh verse to prove the unity of essence, and, 2. because, to defend his own absurd hypothesis, that *unum* is always meant of essence, he explains away the eighth verse into an allegory.

But in truth, Sir, this way of quoting Augustine is a mockery of reason. We ask for a passage, where Augustine has formally appealed to scripture for the three heavenly witnesses. You produce a sentence, in which Augustine says of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, "these three are one," in his own words, without any reference to scripture, or mark of a quotation. In the mean time you cautiously keep back the argument from Augustine's allegory, and bring scraps of quotations that can only amuse the most ignorant readers. Bengelius is much more consistent. He thinks, that the verse was withdrawn from the public copies by the *Disciplina Arcani*. Allow him his premises, and his conclusions will easily follow: 1. that no argument can be drawn from the silence of the ancient writers; and, 2. that in these short sentences they might covertly allude to the disputed text. I shall only observe, that if we suppose the first Christians to have treated the scriptures in this manner, we at once destroy the certainty and authority of our present canon. But whoever supposes, as I think every defender of the text ought to suppose, that it was extant and publicly known from the beginning, cannot, with the smallest appearance of reason, pretend that it ought not to be formally and directly cited in almost every treatise on the Trinity.

Indeed the argument from Augustine's allegory is so plain and strong, that Beza fairly says, "*Non legit Augustinus*:" Bengelius avoids it by the *Disciplina Arcani*; and Martin himself sinks under the weight of the objection, and only not yields the point in his dissertation. In his *Examen* he makes a faint defence; but when Emlyn replied, he quitted the untenable post. And it is self-evident, that no man who had before him a clear passage for the doctrine of the Trinity, a passage where the three persons are distinctly named, would quote the adjacent sentence, and explain it mystically of the same doctrine, unless he were determined to turn the scripture into needless tautology, and weaken the force of his own reasoning.

But "in Jerome's testament this verse is read without any doubt of its authenticity." Without any doubt of its authenticity? You inform us elsewhere, that all the present Latin Mss. are copies of Jerome's version. But many of the oldest of these Mss. totally omit the heavenly witnesses, and many retain them in a suspicious manner. I have said enough on this subject in my sixth letter, and shall not repeat it here. The question is, which of these copies preserves the genuine reading; and therefore, when you say, that the verse is read in Jerome's testament, you assume the very thing which you ought to prove. But

to help out this lame argument you produce two quotations. The first is, "In essence therefore they are one." "*Itaque substantia unum sunt.*" You translate it, *these* [three] *are one*. Why add, *these* without warrant from your original? Or why add *three*, though, I own, you distinguish it from the words of your author? Is it necessary to the sense? Or must the words *unum sunt*, whenever and wherever they are applied to the Trinity, be always meant for a direct quotation of 1 John v. 7.? You are then blamably negligent in not increasing your orthodox witnesses with Marius Victorinus, whom you might have found quoted by Bengelius in the same paragraph with Marcus Celedensis. The second testimony of Jerome you produce from his explanation of faith to Cyrillus: "To us there is one Father, one Son—and one Holy Ghost—and these three are one." But after reading a page, we find, that the quotation of which you here make a present to Jerome, belongs to Marcus Celedensis. Whether it belongs to him, I know not. It is only a conjecture of the learned from an epistle of Jerome's to Marcus Celedensis, in which he uses these words: "*De fide, quam dignatus es scribere sancto Cyrillo, dedi conscriptam fidem.*" Hence you argue, p. 168, that Jerome approved of Marcus's creed, and wrote another of his own. Let it be supposed, to save trouble, that Marcus is the real author of this creed, and that Jerome intends the same. How could Jerome suspect, that these words were meant for a quotation of scripture, without his friend's dropping the least hint of it? Marcus Celedensis only explains his own doctrine; which he does not profess to do in the words of scripture. Besides, your argument takes for granted that Jerome examined all the quotations with scrupulous minuteness; a task to which, I believe, very few friends or readers submit. But when Jerome came to this passage, which bears no mark of a quotation, he must have been the prince of conjurers to have divined his correspondent's intention. In short, Sir, the creed addressed to Damasus is universally acknowledged not to be Jerome's; and if it were his, our verse is not quoted in it. The creed ascribed to Marcus Celedensis does not refer to the verse, and, if it did, would signify nothing in the dispute about Jerome. However, you are perfectly consistent in defending a spurious reading by spurious authorities.

But the weightiest evidence remains, the Prologue to the Canonical Epistles. At the request or command of Pope Damasus, Jerome revised the Latin translation, and corrected it on the faith of the Greek Mss. Did he therefore replace the three heavenly witnesses at this revision, or not? If he did, why did he not then write his preface to inform the world of his recovered reading? But after Damasus was dead, Eustochium, it seems, a young lady, at once devout, handsome, and learned, requests him once more to revise the Catholic epistles and correct them from the

Greek. Jerome undertakes the task, and having completed it, advertises her in this prologue, that other inaccurate translators had omitted the testimony of the three heavenly witnesses, the strongest proof of the Catholic faith. Such a story as this carries its own condemnation on its forehead. It has therefore been given up by most of the defenders of the verse; by Mill, by Abbé Roger, by Maffei, Vallarsius, Vitali, Twells, Bengelius. But you tell us, with that extent of information for which your work is notorious, that "the most disturbed imagination did not harbor any such chimeras (as that the prologue was 'not genuine) till the times of Martianay and Simon." You are mistaken, Sir. Sandius¹ had already declared the prologue to be spurious in the year 1670. We are left also to imagine from the manner in which you couple Martianay and Simon, that they were both stanch opposers of the verse. Whereas Martianay is a stanch defender of it and a furious antagonist of Simon. He endeavors to disable some of Simon's arguments against this very prologue, accuses him almost of forgery in quoting a Ms. and of heresy for attacking the genuineness of 1 John v. 7. Nothing, therefore, but the force of truth could make such a critic agree with his adversary in his main proposition. I must add that Kettner, who in his *Dissertation*² on 1 John v. 7. and his *New Vindication*² had contended that the prologue was Jerome's, in a third book called the *History of the text in John*,² candidly acknowledges it to be spurious.

That this judgment is as true as it was impartial, will appear from many considerations. First a great majority of Mss. omits Jerome's name. You answer, that other prefaces, confessedly Jerome's, want his name in Mss. I desire you to point out a preface to any book of the Old Testament, where half as many Mss. omit Jerome's name. Thirty-four of the Mss. that I collated prefix no name; six omitted the prologue; one had lost the leaf; of two I have made no memorandum; in short I have only set down eight which at once retained the prologue and attributed it to Jerome. But Jerome was so popular, every thing that bore his name was so eagerly sought, and so frequently transcribed, that if this prologue had been generally known or thought to be his, the correctors at least would more generally have restored his name, and would constantly have secured the insertion of the prologue in their books. But by being often absent, and often anonymous, it betrays marks of a late birth and dishonorable extraction. It is the hard fate of celebrated authors to have a quantity of trash fathered on them, sometimes by design, and sometimes by mistake. Nobody has been more freely treated in

¹ Append. Interpretat. Paradox. p. 383.

² I. Lips. 1696. p. 57—63. II. Delitii 1702, p. 33—37. III. Francf. et Lips. 1713. p. 134—136. 145. 172.

this way than Jerome. And if this has so often happened to authors since the invention of printing, how often must it have happened before that æra?

In some Mss. the preface is added; yet the heavenly witnesses omitted. But this you and Martin easily solve by laying the blame on the negligence of transcribers. No, Sir, it was not the negligence of the transcribers, but the negligence or forgetfulness of the collators, that was the cause of this disagreement. The prologue was transcribed from a younger Ms. the text of the epistles from an older; written either before the prologue was composed, or at least before it forced itself into general notice.

Some of the Mss. call the epistles Canonical in the title, and all in the prologue, whereas Jerome would have called them *Catholic*. Here you tell us that Jerome has called them *Canonical* in other parts of his works, and send us for satisfaction to his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers. You ought to be told, Sir, that when correct editions are published on the faith of Mss. no critic is allowed to argue from the old and corrupt readings. The editions published by Martianay at Paris, and Vallarsius at Verona, both read *Catholicæ* in the three places of the catalogue, and produce no various reading from their Mss. I have collated ten Mss. one in the Bodleian and nine in the Museum. Two of the thirteenth and one of the fifteenth century have *canonica* without variation; a fourth of the fifteenth century has *canonica* once in the text, but *catholicæ* for a various reading between the lines from the same hand, and *catholicæ* in the text twice without any suspicion. The remaining six Mss. two of which are very ancient, (one at least a thousand years old, Ms. Cotton. Calig. A. 15.) constantly read *catholicæ*, which I shall therefore conclude to be the true reading. Augustine, you add, calls the epistles canonical. His partiality to the Latin usage touches not Jerome, who prided himself too much on his Greek to suffer such an innovation. Augustine quotes "the apostle Jude in his canonical epistle." How would you have exulted, if you had known that Jerome himself in his commentary on Isaiah lxx. t. iii. p. 484. calls the second epistle of Peter *canonical*! And to crown the whole, all the Mss. as Martianay testifies, and two in the Bodleian, as I testify, concur in this reading. Martianay is afraid that this uniform consent of the Mss. somewhat weakens the foregoing argument. But he might have been of good cheer; for there is no resemblance between the two cases. The name *canonical* applied to seven epistles, four of which were less generally received for canonical than most of St. Paul's, is the perfection of absurdity. But it is applied with propriety to a single epistle of the seven, whether doubted or undoubted. For instance, Jerome quoting the second epistle of Peter, which many churches rejected, by this epithet fixes on it the seal of his own opinion and authority. For the

same reason Augustine calls^d the epistle of Jude *canonical*; as if he had said; I know that this epistle is rejected by some, but in my opinion it is the genuine composition of the apostle. If on the other hand a writer rejecting the second epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, &c. had occasion to quote any of the other three, he might justly say, "St. Peter writes in his canonical epistle," thus distinguishing the true from the counterfeit money. This, if I mistake not, was the true reason why the Catholic epistles by degrees gained the title of *canonical*. For when the later writers saw their predecessors separately call the epistles *canonical*, they with great judgment gave them the same epithet in the lump. Our argument, Sir, is, not that Jerome never calls a single epistle *canonical*, for that he might have done by any of St. Paul's, if it had pleased him, but that he calls the whole seven *Catholic* in his genuine works, while the prologue calls them *canonical*.

The fame of Jerome was so far extended, and his authority so great, that if a prologue of his composition, containing such important information, had been constantly known and read from the beginning of the fifth century, it must have been quoted by some of the intermediate writers between the fifth and the ninth, a space of time in which Jerome's version triumphed over all preceding translations. If this prologue had been universally acknowledged for Jerome's, how could Bede overlook it? Bede's silence both with respect to the disputed verse and the prologue is a complete proof that he knew nothing of the prologue, and a probable argument that it was not even extant in his life. The only appeals to it are made by Walafrid Strabus in the ninth, and the Sorbonne Correctorium in the tenth, century. This last author seems to have been overburdened with judgment, for he says, "Here some of the Greek Mss. are corrupted, as St. Jerome observes." We may therefore suppose, that the prologue was written in some part of the time between Bede's death and the ninth century.

But if there were no other objection to this prologue, the style alone would determine it not to be Jerome's. Whatever be his subject, his language is always spirited and perspicuous; while the prologue is written in a barbarous and uncouth jargon. To make it the more barbarous, you have followed those editions (Append. p. 6. 13.) which read, *quod sunt* for *ut sint*, and *translatoribus ponentes*. But I shall pass by these expressions, though, if they were genuine, they would clear Jerome from all suspicion.

Next, let us consider the reasoning and connexion. "As we formerly corrected the Evangelists to the line of truth, so we have by God's assistance restored these [epistles] to their proper order." The real Jerome could never have indulged himself in so silly a parallel, when he might have said, and ought to have said, "*ita et has,*

Deo juvante, Græcæ fidei reddidimus." This would have been a proper subject for his joy and piety, instead of childishly commending himself for such a trifle as restoring the order of the epistles. It is also observable, that though the main drift of the author was to give currency to his favorite verse of the three heavenly witnesses, he is afraid to affirm directly that it was in the Greek Mss. and only insinuates that falsehood in cautious and perplexed language: "Which epistles, if they were faithfully so turned into Latin, as they are arranged by them," (the Apostles, I suppose) "neither would create doubts in the readers, nor would the varieties of readings impugn one another; especially in that place of John where we read of the unity of the Trinity; in which we find the unfaithful translators to have erred much from the true faith; putting only three names,—and omitting the witness of the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, by which the catholic faith is chiefly strengthened, and the one deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost proved." First, here is another ridiculous opposition of *so* and *as*. "If the translators had been *as* diligent in translating the epistles *as* the apostles (or the Greeks, for *ab iis* may be referred to them) have been in arranging the same epistles." Nor do I believe that Jerome would have used such language as this, "*Neque sermonum sese varietates impugnant.*" Besides, the author does not positively affirm that he has restored the verse on the authority of Greek Mss. but in order to possess the reader with that belief, envelopes his meaning in a cloud of words. This objection will not seem of little weight to those who know that many persons will insinuate a falsehood, which they dare not assert in explicit terms. If Jerome himself had told us such a piece of news as is hinted in the prologue, he would have spoken out and told it plainly, whether it were true or false. If it were true, an affected obscurity would be as needless, as it was contrary to his manner. If it were false, he would have affirmed it no less boldly and called God to witness no less solemnly, than when he attested the miracle of his being whipped by angels for reading profane authors; or when he wrote the lives of Paul¹ and Hilarion, which you have so well defended.

¹ Mr. Travis says that Jerome wrote these lives, "not as positive facts, but to teach some moral or spiritual duty, and to inculcate what is useful and good." And he compares them to Pilpay and *Æsop's Fables*, to Homer's two poems, and to Jotham's parable. I shall therefore give the outlines of Jerome's life of Paul, that the unlearned reader may be better able to calculate the quantity of "good and useful" instruction contained in it.

"Antony thought himself the most perfect monk in the world, till he was told in a vision, that there was one much more perfect than he, and that he must set out on a visit to the prince of anchorites. Antony departed on this errand, and in his journey through the desert saw a

But if Jerome had told us, that his Greek Mss. contained the three heavenly witnesses, he would have told a notorious falsehood. That all the Greeks before his time and all for many ages after it, should know nothing of this text, or entirely neglect it; that all the visible Greek Mss. which have survived to the present day, should omit it; and yet that Jerome found a cluster of Greek Mss. all of which retained it, this, according to the common course of things, is incredible and impossible. What a strange revolution, as Erasmus justly observes, that in Jerome's time the Latin copies should be defective and the Greek perfect, when at present the Latin have repaired their loss, and the Greek are become defective!

centaur. Jerome modestly doubts whether it was the natural produce of the soil, fruitful in monsters, or whether the devil assumed this shape to fright the holy man. Some time after he saw a Satyr, with a horned forehead and goat's feet, who presented him with some dates as hostages of peace, and confessed that he was one of the false deities, whom the deluded Gentiles worshipped. At last Antony, quite weary and exhausted, found Paul, and, while they were discoursing together, who should appear on a sudden, but a raven with a loaf, which he laid down in their sight. Every day, said Paul to Antony, I receive half a loaf, but on your arrival Christ has given his soldiers double provision. He also told Antony, that he himself should shortly die; he therefore desired to be buried in the same cloak that Antony received from Athanasius. Antony set out full speed to fetch the cloak, but Paul was dead before his return. Here was a fresh distress; Antony could find no spade or pickaxe to dig a grave. But while he was in this perplexity, two lions approached with so piteous a roaring, that he perceived they were lamenting the deceased after their unpolished fashion. They then began to scratch the earth with their feet, till they had hollowed a place big enough to contain a single body. After Antony had buried his friend's carcase in this hole, the two lions came to him, and by their signs and fawning asked his blessing, which he kindly gave them, and they departed in very good humor."

Something of the same nature happened to St. Daphnis, as we learn from those ecclesiastical historians who "inculcate what is useful and good." Theocritus, i. 71. Τίπον χὼ' ἔδρ'μοιο λίων ἐκλαυσεν θανάοντα—and Virgil, v. 27.

Daphni, tuum Pœnos etiam ingemuisse leones

In montesque feros* silvasque loquuntur.

All the inference that I wish to draw from this long note is, that Mr. Travis has not read Jerome's lives of the saints which he has so manfully defended.

* I follow Markland's emendation, which Mr. Heyne has misrepresented. He imputes to Markland an absurd reading, *montesque feros, silvasque*, and condemns the emendation for its awkward arrangement of the mourners, in putting the wild beasts between the mountains and woods. I mention this oversight, merely to strengthen an opinion, which I have long entertained, and shall always resolutely defend, That all men are liable to error.

You object, that the expression "*infideles translatores*" does not mean the generality of translators. When an expression of this kind is used without limitation, an author who wishes to be understood, as the real Jerome would wish, must be understood to mean it generally. If only a few translators were guilty, why does he not restrain his meaning by such words, as *paucis*, *quibusdam*, &c.? I agree with you, that "*infideles*" signifies no more than "*inaccurate*." But if Jerome had attributed such an omission to the interpreters, he would not have dismissed them with so gentle a reprimand. The softest names that he could find for them, would then be, mid-day devils, mad-dogs, blasphemous heretics, two-footed asses, &c. If he thought it merely an error, I have so good an opinion of his critical abilities, as to believe that he would have accused the unskilful scribes, and not the unfaithful translators. And if only a few of the Latin copies were faulty, it was idle to single out this place as a specimen of the superior correctness of his own edition. In fact it is apparent that, whenever this prologue was written, most of the Latin copies wanted 1 John v. 7. and that it was written for the express purpose of providing a remedy for this defect. I shall here take notice of a circumstance which I forgot to mention in its place. The Greek-English editor of the N. T. in 1729 appealed to an ancient *Correctorium*, which asserts, that this verse was wanting in the old Latin Mss. On which Twells says, "We call on him to show where," &c. intimating that the editor was a liar. However, it happens that such a *Correctorium* did exist, and was collated by Lucas Brugensis. He calls its author Epanorthotes, and highly extols his diligence and fidelity. And his note on 1 John v. 7. is no bad example of those qualities: "*Epanorthetes deesse hæc eadem Græcis libris et antiquis Latinis notat.*" Who can deny that by the indefinite phrase "*Græcis libris*," must be meant "all the Greek Mss.?" Since therefore in the time of Epanorthotes, all the Greek and the older Latin Mss. omitted the three heavenly witnesses; since by consequence his Mss. exactly agreed with those which have been afterwards collated by different editors, at different times and places, this coincidence not only proves his good faith and accuracy, but the superior excellence of his Latin Mss. You tell us, and with great truth, I believe, that all Jerome's Mss. are lost. But how happens it, that they differed so widely from all others? Jerome's good fortune in getting a band of these Mss. into his possession, is exactly parallel with Stephens's in finding a large number of the same sort. What pity that all the orthodox Mss. after being once collated, should immediately withdraw themselves, and neither listen to the invitation of their friends nor the challenge of their enemies!

Again, if Jerome had written this prologue, the chief aim of which is to bring into common use this strongest proof of the

Trinity, would he never have thought of introducing it in his other works? He is very proud, in one of his epistles, of having restored "serving the Lord," Rom. xii. 11. instead of "serving the time." What a trifling occasion to praise himself was this compared to the other! Would he not have been in haste to tell Augustine of this grand discovery? Augustine, who looked with an evil eye on Jerome's new edition, could not fail of being fully reconciled to it, when he had learned what an accession of strength it brought to the catholic faith. Augustine and Jerome corresponded on biblical subjects infinitely less important. You are not insensible of the force of this argument, as appears from the miserable shifts to which you are reduced in attempting to elude it. First "he has inserted the heavenly witnesses in his version," the very point in debate. Secondly, "he has quoted them in two creeds," neither of which is written by Jerome, neither of which can be proved to quote the heavenly witnesses. But to let you into a secret, none of the prologues to the separate parts of the N. T. are Jerome's. They are all rhapsodies without method or meaning: without Jerome's learning, style, or spirit; written long after his time, sometimes adorned with extracts from his catalogue or epistles. Bengelius quotes a prologue to the Acts, which is manifestly spurious, and seems, as he observes, to be the handy-work of the same author, who favored us with the prologue to the Catholic Epistles. He has inscribed it to two other friends of Jerome, to Domnion and Rogatianus. For all these reasons, I agree with Bengelius that this prologue is a forgery, but I cannot think with him that the author of it was acquainted with Greek Mss. Indeed he seems to distrust his own opinion, for he adds, at the end of the paragraph, "*Qui firmos testes ex Græca antiquitate producet, gratiam ab ecclesia inibit.*"

The good Eucherius is your next witness, in whose *Formulæ Spiritualis Intelligentiæ Martin* (Dissert. p. 78.) found the disputed verse and brought it forward with great parade. However, as we ought to restore every man his own, it is necessary to observe that Mill had already produced the passage, *Proleg.* 938. You too, Sir, in imitation of Martin, are here extremely alert. You say that Emlyn ingenuously confesses his embarrassment. Whether you have acted ingenuously let the public judge. Could a reader, who reads your quotation from Emlyn, guess that he spends two pages to show that the passage is interpolated? It would truly have been, as you call it p. 40, 81. "a poor refuge to affect a doubt," without giving any reasons. Emlyn's reasons are, 1. That Eucherius in his *Quæstiones V. et N. T.* explains the water, the blood, and the spirit, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. That in his *Formulæ* therefore he seems only to have quoted the eighth verse, because it is not likely that Eucherius or any body else, seeing the doctrine of the Trinity clearly revealed in the

seventh verse, should extract it from the eighth by an unnatural interpretation. 2. That transcribers and editors often correct the citations of their authors to the current reading of their own time; particularly that the editor of Eucherius, J. Brassicanus confesses that he took great pains in correcting the faults, and that "he added what was wanting." It is therefore probable that this passage is one of those additions, which, 3. is the more probable, because the design of Eucherius, as the very title of his work imports, was to give hidden and mystical senses of Scripture. The eighth verse was sufficient for this purpose; the seventh would have been superfluous.

Eucherius in his Questions, after saying that in 1 John v. 8. there seems to be a reference to the Gospel xix. 30. thus proceeds: "Some therefore think that by the water is meant baptism; by the blood, martyrdom; by the spirit, the person himself who passes through martyrdom to the Lord. Yet the majority here understands the Trinity itself by a mystical interpretation, because it bears witness to Christ; by the water indicating the Father, for he says of himself, Jer. ii. 13. 'They have left me the fountain of living water;' by the blood demonstrating Christ, and referring to his passion; by the spirit manifesting the Holy Ghost. Now these three thus bear witness of Christ. He himself says in the Gospel, viii. 18. 'I bear witness of myself, and the Father who sent me bears witness of me.' And again, xv. 26. 'When the Comforter is come—he shall bear witness of me.' The Father therefore bears witness when he says, Matth. xvii. 5. 'This is my beloved Son.' The Son, when he says, John x. 30. 'I and my Father are one.' The Holy Spirit; when it is said of him, Matth. iii. 16. 'And he saw the Holy Spirit descending,' &c."

1. From this labored illustration, and the pains taken to fortify it, Eucherius plainly shows, that he himself is one of the many (*plures*) who embraced the mystical interpretation. Martin (who does not easily miss any error that lies in his way) insists that *plures* means no more than *some* or *several* (*pluricurs.*) I wonder not that Emlin was sick of disputing with so wretched a sophist. If *plures* might elsewhere admit of either sense, here it can only mean a *majority*, because it is opposed to *quidam*, and *tamen* added.

2. Lardner¹ rightly infers, that the author who wrote this passage, could not know any thing of the heavenly witnesses. He therefore corrects the text of Eucherius in this manner: "I. Hic numerus ad unitatem deitatis refertur, &c. II. ad duo testamenta divinæ legis referuntur, &c. III. ad Trinitatem in Joannis epistola, *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus.*" "No. 1 is referred to the unity of God, No. 2 to the two testaments,

¹ Credibility, Part II. ch. 137. vol. xi. p. 170—174. or vol. v. p. 226—239.

No. 3 to the Trinity, in the epistle of John, *There are three that bear record, the water, the blood, and the spirit*. I shall observe, by the way, that Martin took the sentence out of its connexion, discarded the numeral, supplied *legimus* instead of *referuntur*, and so translated (in which you have followed him) "As to the Trinity, we read," &c. When Emlyn objected, that Eucherius might only quote the eighth verse as referring to the Trinity, Martin had the assurance (Exam. c. 8.) to maintain that the word *Trinitas* does not here signify the Trinity in a theological sense, but simply *the number three*. So that, according to him, the passage furnishes this rare sense, "*As to the number three*, we read in St. John's epistle, *There are three, &c.*!" But he would have asserted any thing, rather than relinquish an argument or authority that he once had espoused.

3. Whoever compares the Formulæ with the Questions, will find that Lardner's emendation or something like it, must be the true reading. And I do reassert, that no writer in his perfect mind could possibly adopt this allegorical exposition of the eighth verse, if the seventh were extant in his copy. Even a madman would have method in his madness. "For sense to extasy was ne'er so thrall'd, But it reserv'd some quantity of choice, To serve in such a difference." I appeal to any orthodox reader, whether he would force an indirect confession of his favorite doctrine, from one text by torture, when he might have a clear, full, and voluntary evidence from its next neighbor. The supposition is still more ridiculous that Eucherius should make this quotation for no possible use.

Bengelius, though he had endeavored to work himself up to a belief (in which however he soon falters) that Augustine's exposition of the eighth verse was consistent with his knowledge of the seventh, Bengelius, I say, clearly saw, that if Eucherius wrote the allegory in the Questions, he could not possibly have the heavenly witnesses in his copy. He therefore devised an ingenious expedient to avoid the attacks of the enemy. He supposed that the author of the Formulæ is a different person from the author of the Questions. But this expedient Lardner and Mr. Griesbach spoil by telling us from Gennadius, that Eucherius dedicated his Questions and some of his other works to his two sons. And to heighten the distress of the scene, these Questions and Formulæ are in fact respectively dedicated to these two sons, Saloni^{us} and Verani^{us}.

Mr. Griesbach adds, that Eucherius's first question is, "From what texts the Trinity is proved?" He answers, "From the beginning of Genesis, 'Let us make man,' &c. from Psalm xxxvi. 2. 'By the word of the Lord,' &c. from Matth. xxviii. 19. (the form of baptism); and from Rom. xi. 36. 'From him and by him,' &c. But not a word of the disputed verse, which would have

been an excellent corollary, and would have presented us (as Kettner finely expresses it) with "St. John's divinity in a nutshell." Surely if Eucherius knew of this verse, and yet with such fair, such provoking opportunities to quote it, was still obstinately silent, he could not be a sincere Trinitarian, but either betrayed the sacred deposit which the church had entrusted in his hands, or instead of being properly and rationally orthodox, he only blundered round about orthodoxy.

Mr. Griesbach also observes, that Flacius has only inserted the earthly witnesses in his edition of the Formulæ. You mention this objection, p. 299. but prudently avoid answering it. So considerable an omission could neither be overlooked by Flacius nor his printers. He either published his edition from a Ms. or another edition. Here then is reading against reading, which shall we prefer? By all the rules of criticism, the reading which makes an author consistent with himself. If we follow Flacius; we agree with Eucherius's quotation of Scripture in another place unsuspected of corruption or interpolation. But if we follow Brassicanus, we make Eucherius quote a text for which he had no occasion; a text which he has not quoted where it was necessary, or at least where it would have been signally useful; a text, which, if Eucherius could be supposed to know of it, would determine him to be the dullest of mortals, and passionately fond of nonsense and tautology.

Let us however review the words of Eucherius: *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus, et tres qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis.* How it strengthens the authority of our present vulgate that this quotation differs not from it in the smallest tittle! In the Questions there are some odd various readings. The eighth verse, as there quoted, differs from the Formulæ four times. 1. In turning the masculines into neuters. 2. In substituting *perhibent* for *dant*. 3. In omitting *in terra*. 4. In altering the order of the witnesses. But what is more extraordinary is, that Flacius's edition of the Formulæ reads as all the editions of the Questions read, and contains neither less nor more than these words: *Tria sunt quæ testimonium perhibent, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus.* That this reading is genuine, is plain on inspection, because, 1. It is the shorter. 2. It is the less orthodox.¹ 3. It differs greatly from the common editions of the Latin version. 4. It exactly agrees with Eucherius's citation of the same verse in another part of his works. 5. It transposes the witnesses so, that in the allegorical interpretation they may severally correspond with the persons of the Trinity which they typify.

¹ By the orthodox I mean that opinion which, whether true or false, prevails in the time and country of the transcribers or editors.

No. 3 to the Trinity, in the epistle of John, *There are three that bear record, the water, the blood, and the spirit*. I shall observe, by the way, that Martin took the sentence out of its connexion, discarded the numeral, supplied *legimus* instead of *referuntur*, and so translated (in which you have followed him) "As to the Trinity, we read," &c. When Emlyn objected, that Eucherius might only quote the eighth verse as referring to the Trinity, Martin had the assurance (Exam. c. 8.) to maintain that the word *Trinitas* does not here signify the Trinity in a theological sense, but simply *the number three*. So that, according to him, the passage furnishes this rare sense, "*As to the number three, we read in St. John's epistle, There are three, &c.!*" But he would have asserted any thing, rather than relinquish an argument or authority that he once had espoused.

3. Whoever compares the Formulæ with the Questions, will find that Lardner's emendation or something like it, must be the true reading. And I do reassert, that no writer in his perfect mind could possibly adopt this allegorical exposition of the eighth verse, if the seventh were extant in his copy. Even a madman would have method in his madness. "For sense to extasy was ne'er so thrall'd, But it reserv'd some quantity of choice, To serve in such a difference." I appeal to any orthodox reader, whether he would force an indirect confession of his favorite doctrine, from one text by torture, when he might have a clear, full, and voluntary evidence from its next neighbor. The supposition is still more ridiculous that Eucherius should make this quotation for no possible use.

Bengelius, though he had endeavored to work himself up to a belief (in which however he soon falters) that Augustine's exposition of the eighth verse was consistent with his knowledge of the seventh, Bengelius, I say, clearly saw, that if Eucherius wrote the allegory in the Questions, he could not possibly have the heavenly witnesses in his copy. He therefore devised an ingenious expedient to avoid the attacks of the enemy. He supposed that the author of the Formulæ is a different person from the author of the Questions. But this expedient Lardner and Mr. Griesbach spoil by telling us from Gennadius, that Eucherius dedicated his Questions and some of his other works to his two sons. And to heighten the distress of the scene, these Questions and Formulæ are in fact respectively dedicated to these two sons, Salonius and Veranius.

Mr. Griesbach adds, that Eucherius's first question is, "From what texts the Trinity is proved?" He answers, "From the beginning of Genesis, 'Let us make man,' &c. from Psalm xxxvi. 2. 'By the word of the Lord,' &c. from Matth. xxviii. 19. (the form of baptism); and from Rom. xi. 36. 'From him and by him,'" &c. But not a word of the disputed verse, which would have

been an excellent corollary, and would have presented us (as Kettner finely expresses it) with “St. John’s divinity in a nutshell.” Surely if Eucherius knew of this verse, and yet with such fair, such provoking opportunities to quote it, was still obstinately silent, he could not be a sincere Trinitarian, but either betrayed the sacred deposit which the church had entrusted in his hands, or instead of being properly and rationally orthodox, he only blundered round about orthodoxy.

Mr. Griesbach also observes, that Flacius has only inserted the earthly witnesses in his edition of the Formulæ. You mention this objection, p. 299. but prudently avoid answering it. So considerable an omission could neither be overlooked by Flacius nor his printers. He either published his edition from a Ms. or another edition. Here then is reading against reading, which shall we prefer? By all the rules of criticism, the reading which makes an author consistent with himself. If we follow Flacius, we agree with Eucherius’s quotation of Scripture in another place unsuspected of corruption or interpolation. But if we follow Brassicanus, we make Eucherius quote a text for which he had no occasion; a text which he has not quoted where it was necessary, or at least where it would have been signally useful; a text, which, if Eucherius could be supposed to know of it, would determine him to be the dullest of mortals, and passionately fond of non-sense and tautology.

Let us however review the words of Eucherius: *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus, et tres qui testimonium dant in terra, spiritus, aqua, et sanguis.* How it strengthens the authority of our present vulgate that this quotation differs not from it in the smallest tittle! In the Questions there are some odd various readings. The eighth verse, as there quoted, differs from the Formulæ four times. 1. In turning the masculines into neuters. 2. In substituting *perhibent* for *dant*. 3. In omitting *in terra*. 4. In altering the order of the witnesses. But what is more extraordinary is, that Flacius’s edition of the Formulæ reads as all the editions of the Questions read, and contains neither less nor more than these words: *Tria sunt quæ testimonium perhibent, aqua, sanguis, et spiritus.* That this reading is genuine, is plain on inspection, because, 1. It is the shorter. 2. It is the less orthodox.¹ 3. It differs greatly from the common editions of the Latin version. 4. It exactly agrees with Eucherius’s citation of the same verse in another part of his works. 5. It transposes the witnesses so, that in the allegorical interpretation they may severally correspond with the persons of the Trinity which they typify.

¹ By the orthodox I mean that opinion which, whether true or false, prevails in the time and country of the transcribers or editors.

If any pains-taking critic wades through these letters, as I shall be always ready to testify my admiration of his patience, so I think he cannot refuse to pay me the same compliment, when he sees me thus laboriously answering objections, which (as you falsely say of Mr. Griesbach's p. 300.) "are brought forward without even the decency of an attempt to support them." But to close the account of Eucherius. The true reading, which Lardner almost found out by conjecture, is that which I have quoted from Flacius. If it will not satisfy you, it will at least satisfy every body else, to know that there are two early editions of Eucherius, one printed at Basil, 1530, the other at Paris without any date of the year. These editions so often differ in their readings, that they were certainly derived from separate Mss. But though they vary so much in other places, they here lovingly concur in the shorter reading above mentioned. So far therefore (to use Mr. Griesbach's words) was Eucherius from quoting 1 John v. 7. that it is on the contrary most clear and evident that this verse never was in his copy.

We have now run over all the Latins down to the middle of the fifth century, without finding any express quotation of this unfortunate verse, or even any appearance of it, except in Cyprian. But before we come to the end of the same century, such a proof is produced, as must for ever strike the heretics mute. For the four hundred Catholic bishops that Hunneric summoned to Carthage, to hear what they had to say in defence of the homoïasian doctrine, quote the three heavenly witnesses, as a proof of the Trinity "clearer than day," and this without expressing any doubt on their own side, or meeting with any opposition from their adversaries. Martin seems to think that every one of these four hundred bishops had a bible in his pocket, and the useful places doubled down! I would gladly know by what miracle four hundred copies of St. John's epistle unanimously consented in a reading, that a hundred years before, according to the complaint which you suppose Jerome to make, was omitted by the "unfaithful translators?" How Eucherius, as I have just now proved, was ignorant of it fifty years before? How Facundus was equally ignorant of it fifty years after? This verse has been gaining ground in the Latin copies from the sixth century to the eleventh; yet, I dare say, if we should now collect four hundred Latin Mss. at a venture, we should find several of them omitting the heavenly witnesses; perhaps a majority of those that are not later than the tenth century. Or were these holy fathers such acute and inquisitive critics, that they would cite nothing from Scripture which was not in all the Mss.? If any passage that suited their purpose occurred in some particular copies, would they not defend it for genuine, though the weight of external evidence was in the opposite scale? But not to multiply such queries, we

know, if we know any thing, that an implicit faith of this kind has been the occasion of innumerable mistakes. Does not Ambrose defend a reading against the heretics, merely because it is orthodox, for he owns that it is wanting in a vast majority of the copies? In the same manner, if the Catholic bishops found in ever so few of their Mss. a text like 1 John v. 7. "clearer than the day" for their doctrine, they would doubtless presume it to be genuine. It would be in vain to urge them with the great balance of contrary testimonies. "*Nihil est audacius illis Deprensis: iram atque animos a crimine sumunt.*" They would argue, (falsely and absurdly indeed, but still they would argue) "1. That omissions of the verse were neither positive contradictions nor direct impeachments; only food for conjecture, and conjecture has no weight against positive facts p. 346.—2. That the omission might easily happen here, by reason of the similar beginning and ending of the two verses. 3. That the scope and connexion of the apostle's reasoning required this insertion. 4. That the Arians erased it; and that the Arians played such pranks is clear from more than one positive declaration of Ambrose." I allow that all these reasons are false and frivolous; it is enough for me, that they have frequently been employed in defence of this very passage. The unanimous testimony therefore of the four hundred bishops will by no means prove that the verse was then in all the copies, since, if it were in a very few of them, an eager disputant would seize it, and maintain it against all objections, by such arguments as I have stated above. "*Qui amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt.*" How many divines at this day quote 1 John v. 7. not only without hinting any scruple of their own, but without deigning to inform their readers that it has been called in question by others! It would be a labor of Hercules to enumerate all the inferior writers who have acted in this manner, and imposed on the simplicity of the unlearned. I shall content myself with referring to a few, and they shall be all bishops. Wake, Exposition of the Catechism, p. 58. Secker, Lecture XIII. Pearson on the Creed, Art. viii. p. 323. Beveridge, Private Thoughts, part i. p. 27. II. p. 40, 47. Huet, Demonstr. Evang. Prop. ix. cap. 25, 82. Gastrell, Christian Institutes, p. 132. Atterbury, vol. i. Sermon. x. p. 266. Here are two archbishops and five bishops, who have all applied the very verse in debate to prove the Trinity, without mentioning any argument against it, or producing any in its behalf. Yet none of them could be ignorant of the fierce disputes to which it had given rise. Some of them (Huet and Pearson) were professed critics, and ought not to have quoted it, without showing their own reasons, or confuting their adversaries. Wake had in his possession five Greek Mss. that omitted the verse. Pearson had defended the vulgar reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16. in the same book, where he has quoted the heavenly witnesses without

any comment. An unlearned reader could not help concluding from this circumstance, that by defending one controverted reading, he thereby declared that none of his other quotations had ever been controverted; according to that logical rule, of which you make so judicious a use p. 302. "Exceptio probat regulam in non exceptis." "But the four hundred bishops dared not to urge in dispute a passage that was extant only in a few copies, when they must be detected and exposed by the Arians." I have partly answered this objection, and I add, that an effectual answer to it may be found in the conduct of the greater part of divines. So many of the defenders of the Trinity have employed this text in controversy, that they appear to have thought it lawful to quote any passage which seemed to them genuine, without paying any attention to the objections of others. Thus Dr. Wallis in his first letter on the Trinity quotes our verse as a clear and decisive argument. It was not till his adversary had disputed its authenticity, that he condescended to give his reasons (such as they are) in its defence. Thus Dr. Wells in his answer to Dr. Clarke adopted the verse without mentioning a syllable of its doubtful character. Dr. Clarke replied that the verse was spurious. Dr. Wells rejoined, that in his judgment Grabe had sufficiently proved it to be genuine in his notes on Bull's Nicene Faith. Very lately, a Mr. Barnard has written some letters to Dr. Priestley, in which he four times quotes this verse, as one of his principal arguments, though he ought to have known that Dr. Priestley had publicly rejected it, long before the publication of Mr. Barnard's answer. A friend of yours, the author of a Vindication of the Doctrines and Liturgy of the Church of England, p. 32, 24. quotes Acts xx. 28. 1 Tim. iii. 16. without hinting that the Mss. vary, or that the common reading has ever been disputed. In the former quotation he prints the words, *his own blood*, in Italics. And if the author of the Hints to the new Association, whom this author confutes, had not expressly singled out 1 John v. 7. and declared it spurious, he would have quoted that too with the same modesty, for it appears among his scriptural proofs of the Pseudo-Athanasian Verity, p. 26. In short, it is idle, fraudulent, contrary to reason and to fact, to argue, that, because a passage is quoted in controversy, it is therefore genuine and extant in all the copies.

If the person deputed by the Catholics to draw up their common confession of faith, had found this passage in a single Ms. or even quoted by any other writer, and on the strength of such authority admitted it into his collection of scriptural proofs, what would have been the event? They would not have staid to form their judgment of the author from his composition, but have adjusted their opinion of the composition to their previous esteem for the author. If, for instance, the venerable Eugenius was the composer, not a bishop present but would have subscribed heart

and hand to any thing that came from his pen. Like the organist of Utrecht,¹ who signed the articles of the Contraremonstrants without reading them, and being pressed to read them at least once, answered, "It is needless. I know well enough that you, gentlemen, would not require me to do an ill thing." I am sure, that if every individual bishop of the four hundred, after a diligent perusal of this confession, could subscribe sincerely to every part of it, that is to say, if he believed all the quotations apt, and all the reasonings just, it would be an imperceptible extension of his faith, to believe one of the quotations genuine, though he had never heard of it before. And if some member of the assembly for a moment had given way to any untoward suspicions, he would quickly repress them with Benedick's argument,² "I should think this a gull, but that the white-bearded fellow speaks it; knavery cannot surely hide itself in such reverence."

"In the fourth century the controversies about the Trinity were very warmly debated, and the orthodox hastily caught at every thing that they apprehended favorable to their cause, and oftentimes made use of such texts to prove their doctrine by, as were by no means proper for their purpose. A man must be a great stranger to their writings, who has not observed this. Their zeal for a fundamental doctrine frequently hurried them on so fast, that they did not duly weigh and consider their arguments."

Thus Dr. Bennet.³ To the same purpose Dr. Horsley.⁴ "In popular discourses and in argument (the Fathers) were too apt to sacrifice somewhat of the accuracy of fact to the plausibility of their rhetoric; or, which is much the same thing, they were too ready to adopt any notion, which might serve a present purpose, without nicely examining its solidity or its remote consequences." From this frank confession of two able defenders of orthodoxy, I infer, that the orthodox Christians of the fifth century (for I suppose a hundred years had made no great improvement or alteration) would have seized any argument that might serve their purpose, and that the compiler of their creed would admit any supposed scriptural quotation, without examining the authorities on which it is founded. It is amusing to consider the different consequences of the same action. In defence of orthodoxy it is lawful to set aside the testimony of the fathers. But let any doubts be hinted, in such a case as the present, concerning their good faith or exactness, heretic and infidel are names too soft for the offender.

At vos Trojugenæ vobis ignoscitis, et quæ
Turpia cerdoni, Voleas Brutumque decebunt.

¹ Jortin's Six Dissertations, ii. p. 106.

² Much Ado about Nothing.

³ On the Common Prayer, Appendix, No. iii. p. 288.

⁴ Tracts, p. 355.

Were the Arians, on reading this confession of the orthodox, so utterly bereft of all reflection, as to give up their cause in despair? They must have been aware of several of the texts which their adversaries would produce. If this verse was then received for genuine, they would be aware of that too, and provide some answer, sufficient or insufficient. Would they be more distressed with it than with John x. 30. *I and my Father are one*? Some of the modern divines declare that this verse does not relate to the consubstantiality of the persons. You yourself have not dared to affirm that it does. Had then none of the four hundred bishops any objections to the use of such an argument? On the other hand, was there no Arian that so far retained his senses as to combat the Catholic interpretation? The utmost inference that can be drawn from this confession is, that the three heavenly witnesses were in the copies of the authors, or in Eugenius's copy, if he were the author. Nobody denies that they might possibly creep into some copies of that time, particularly in Africa, where Cyprian and Augustine were constantly read. But to suppose that they were in all the copies that all these bishops had seen or possessed, because they are in their confession of faith, is to assume two things equally inconsistent with reason and experience, that the Mss. of the N. T. never varied in that age, and that no disputants of any age quote any passages except such as are extant in all the copies, and acknowledged by all parties.

"But Cyrila and his confederate Arians made no objection to this verse." I cannot find that they made any objection to any other quotation or argument of the Catholics. I desire to know, whether this treatise was so vigorous a defence of orthodoxy, that none of the heretics could say a word in answer to it. If they made any answer, Victor has given us a partial and fraudulent account of the transaction. If they disputed at all, they might then object to the genuineness of the new-quoted verse, as well as to any other part of the confession. If the dispute never took place, the Catholics were in no danger of detection, and might safely quote what they liked for Scripture.

If such a confession had been really presented and read; if Cyrila and his accomplices had proposed their objections in detail; if amongst these objections there had been a particular answer to this capital text, endeavoring to divert its force, and explain it away, but no suggestions tending to undermine its authenticity; if the Catholics had then resumed the dispute, reinforced their arguments with fresh aid, and at last set their own cause in so fair and strong a light, that none but the ignorant or obstinate could withstand its evidence; the catastrophe of the drama would have been natural enough, nor would it surprise us to find that Cyrila attempted to convert by force those whom he could not subdue by argument. But Victor's narration, which leaves us to suppose

that nothing at all was said by the heretics, carries in itself the plainest marks of fiction.

“When the day appointed for disputation came, the Catholics chose ten of their number to answer for all. Cyrila was seated on a superb throne. To this elevation the Catholics objected, and asked, Who should be the umpire and examiner? The king’s notary answered, the Patriarch Cyrila. Let us know, said they, by what authority Cyrila takes that name. Whereupon the adversaries, raising a tumult, began to calumniate. And because the orthodox desired that, if an examination was not allowed, the prudent multitude at least might wait, all the sons of the Catholic church who were present are ordered to be beaten with a hundred cudgels. Eugenius exclaims against this treatment, and appeals to heaven. Then the orthodox turned to Cyrila, and said, Propose your sentiments. Cyrila said, I know no Latin. The Catholic bishops answered, We know that you have always spoken Latin; you ought not to refuse now; especially as you have kindled this flame. But he seeing that they were better prepared for the conflict, declined an audience with various pretences; which they foreseeing, had written a decent and sufficient confession of their faith.” [Here follows the confession.] “When this our book was read, they could not bear the light of truth with their blind eyes, taking it very ill that we called ourselves Catholics. And immediately they told lies to the king, that we had raised a tumult and avoided the conference.” Then follows an edict of Hunneric against the Homœusians, which charges them with endeavoring to delay the conference, to excite the people to sedition, and to disturb every thing with their clamors, that the dispute might not take place.

I appeal to the reader, whether this story be not improbable in all its circumstances. First, when the Catholics find fault with Cyrila for exalting himself to a kind of throne, he orders them to be beaten with a hundred cudgels. But on Eugenius’s uttering a short ejaculation, we hear no more of the cudgelling, and the dispute is resumed. They desire Cyrila to begin. He excuses himself, by pleading ignorance of Latin. They give him the lie, and tell him they can prove that he has always spoken Latin. This might seem a sufficient provocation to Cyrila’s fiery temper to repeat his orders about the cudgelling. But he only seeks for cavils and pretences to decline the conflict. How he must have stared, when they pulled out a confession of faith, which, with proper management, would last a modern divine three Sundays! For I presume he would have taken some measures to hinder it from being read, if he had not been stupified by astonishment. The Catholics read their confession audibly and distinctly; when it is finished, the heretics have not one word to say for themselves, good or bad; they therefore dissolve the assembly, and by telling lies to the king persuade him to persecute the orthodox.

As far as I can judge by comparing Victor's narrative with Hunneric's edict, the account given in the edict is partly true. The Catholics were willing to put off the conference and prolong their stay, in order to make converts from the Arian doctrine. This Hunneric considered as a violation of the terms on which he had granted them a safe conduct. In consequence of this charge, the Catholics were imprisoned, banished, doomed to hard labor, tortured, and executed. I make no objection to these wholesome severities on the score of cruelty. For if heretics had been thus served, and Hunneric's faith were pure, the regimen would have been exceedingly mild and proper. But being a heretic himself, I cannot help thinking that he carried matters a little too far. However, it appears, from Victor's own story, from the accusations of delay and tumult which each party brought against the other, that they never came to a formal conference, and that such a confession was neither read nor presented.

Again; if the confession had been presented to Cyrila, and attentively read by him, are you sure that it then contained this quotation? Does an author, when he republishes a work, never "Blot out, correct, insert, refine, Enlarge, diminish, interline?" Are the speeches published for the genuine speeches of our senators never increased or embellished in passing through the press? Did Cicero give every oration of his to the public exactly as he delivered it at the bar or in the senate? When I can bring myself to believe that Thucydides and Livy copied the exact words of their heroes, then will I believe that Victor has given the precise confession of faith that put Cyrila and his impious crew into such confusion. But you say, p. 53, 113. that "Victor's narrative must be circumspect and accurate, because it was written in the face of exasperated enemies, while Arianism sat triumphant on the throne." Victor's history was not written till three years after the persecution. Hunneric was long since dead. His successor was not so violent a persecutor; and, if he was, Victor was now at Constantinople, where he wrote, free from all fears of being either contradicted or persecuted. If no Arian answer to Victor's narrative appeared, which it is impossible to tell, we must consider that in all probability his history was long in travelling to the Arian dioceses. It was written at a great distance from the scene of action, for the edification of the faithful, not for the confutation of heretics. In those days books were less easily procured, and less generally read, than in our time. They were separately transcribed, and diffused with infinite slowness in comparison of the present rapid and extensive circulation.

If I were disposed to make a romance, in imitation of Victor, I should say, that when the Arians came to this text of the three heavenly witnesses quoted in the confession, they demanded in what part of St. John's works they were extant, and, on detecting

the fraud, broke off the conference. That this sacrilege of the Catholics was mentioned as a reason for increasing the severity of their punishment. But you may ask me why I call Victor's history a romance. It deserves that title for the miracles which he has stuffed into it, of which I shall give an abridgment. "The Arians tormented some Catholics who nevertheless were always recovered by the next day, and no traces of their wounds left. A virgin was fastened to a pile of wood, but on a sudden the wood rotted and fell to pieces. (So the keeper told Victor, and confirmed it with an oath.) Bishop Faustus likewise told Victor that he had seen a blind woman recover her sight. When Arbogastes's forehead was bound with cords, he broke them like cobwebs by looking up to heaven. They then brought stronger, which he burst only by invoking the name of Christ. And though he hung on one foot, with his head downwards, he seemed to sleep on the softest bed. When his friend Felix buried him in a lonely place, according to his request, on digging up the earth, he found a sarcophagus of the finest marble, 'such as perhaps no king ever had.' Hunneric sent some of the confessors to reap in the hot weather, at Utica. One of them excused himself, because he had a withered hand; but when he came to the place, behold a miracle! his hand was restored to its strength, and did him yeoman's service. They who were banished into deserts full of scorpions and venomous animals, which formerly destroyed every passenger, all escaped alive and unhurt. Eugenius restored a blind man to sight. A matron rightly called Victoria, after her shoulders were dislocated, and she was thought dead by the tormentors, was suddenly healed by a virgin, who stood by her and touched her limbs. Antony finding Eugenius in a palsy, forced the sharpest vinegar down his mouth, which increased his disease, but Christ restored him to health." Mr. Gibbon has related the miracle of the confessors who spoke after their tongues were cut out, "*sermones politos sine ulla offensione locuti.*" He is so copious in his relation, and so anxious in amassing authorities for it, that it seems almost to persuade him to be an Homoü-sian. I cannot think this such a stupendous miracle as some would represent it. Did not St. Romanus, after his tongue was cut out,¹ make an elegant oration? A case in point. Besides, this miracle is lame and imperfect; for since their right hands also were cut off, to make the wonder complete, they ought to have used their maimed arm as dextrously as if a hand and fingers still belonged to it, "*sermones politos sine ulla offensione scribentes.*" I cannot recollect any defender of 1 John v. 7. except Kettner, who urges this miracle in behalf of the text. Even Martin, who defends most things, is half ashamed of it, and contents him-

¹ Prudentius, *Peristeph.* x. 928.

self with saying, that Victor's easy belief of miracles is no impeachment of his veracity in quoting scripture. But the two circumstances are here very intimately connected. If Victor could relate an improbable miracle for the good of his cause, he might take a scriptural quotation that favored his own cause, on testimony which he ought to have rejected, and would have rejected on an indifferent subject. This reflection will be strengthened by considering that the ecclesiastical writers servilely copy their predecessors; a practice which was then more excusable from causes already mentioned. But now that the art of printing has multiplied the means of knowledge, and increased the danger of detection, does nothing of this kind happen? A single example will suffice. Feuardent, in a note on Irenæus's silly tale about John and Cerinthus, informs us, that as soon as St. John had left the bath, it fell in and crushed Cerinthus to death. For this circumstance he quotes Jerome against the Luciferians. Not a word to this purpose in Jerome. Yet six authors, quoted by Bayle,¹ assert the same story, and that with as confident an air, as if they had good authority for the assertion. Though a common book was quoted, a book written in a language familiar to every pretender to learning, none even of those who adopted the story from Feuardent thought it worth while to verify his quotation. But, in truth, it is much easier and pleasanter to go on believing every thing that we hear or read, than to undergo the labor of inquiry or the pain of suspense.

Our next question is, Who was the author of this confession? From Victor's account we might guess it to be the joint manufacture of the four bishops who are said to have presented it. Gennadius gives Eugenius the whole honor of the composition. Some (moderns, I believe) call Victor himself the author. Bengelius ascribes it to Vigilius Tapsensis (i. e. the author of the books *De Trinitate*). My own opinion is, that it was written by that author (whoever he be), and published under the name of Eugenius. This solution comprehends both Gennadius's assertion and Bengelius's conjecture. Victor finding a book on the subject ready to his hand, with the name of a venerable confessor prefixed, would take it for genuine without farther inquiry, and esteem it the principal ornament of his history. But if any person thinks it more probable that Victor himself wrote the creed, to show that he was no less able a divine than historian, I shall not dispute about so small a matter.

The books *contra Varimadum* and *De Trinitate* have been commonly attributed to Vigilius Tapsensis since Chifflet's edition. But Vigilius, in his disputation against Arius, never refers to the latter. And though he produces a long quotation from his own book against *Varimadus*, not a syllable of it can now be found in the

¹ Dictionnaire, au mot *Cerinthus*.

treatise that bears the false title of Idacius Clarus. Nor is there any appearance that this treatise is mutilated. In short, Vigilius's claims to either of these publications are only supported by some weak and gratuitous conjectures of Chifflet.¹ This was what I meant, when I gave you leave to make two distinct authorities of these two treatises. But though this gracious permission of mine seems at first sight to turn against me, I had, I own, a malicious intention of employing it to my own advantage. Jerome, say the heretics, would have quoted 1 John v. 7. in some of his genuine works, if the prologue were his. No, answers Martin; for Vigilius, who so often uses this verse in his books *De Trinitate* and *contra Varinadum*, never mentions it in the conference of Athanasius and Arius, nor in his treatise against Eutyches, "in which it was scarce to be conceived he could possibly have omitted it." (*Examen*, ch. 4.) But this objection falls, if we reply that the authors of the *Altercatio*, the treatises *De Trinitate* and *contra Varinadum*, have nothing in common, but the assumption of a false title. I will allow, if you insist on it, that the disputed verse had by this time crept into a few copies. Now, as the copies which contain more text, and are more orthodox, generally are preferred to the rest, it was natural that their readings should be taken for genuine, and produced against the heretics. Some of the ancient Greek writers, in explaining the doxology, tack a new clause to it: *For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost*. This is the reading too of an excellent Ms. in the Vatican, Urb. 2. and another at Vienna, Koll. 9. And I hope, at the next revision of our translation, this verse will be corrected "*secundum orthodoxam fidem*." For omissions are no argument against positive testimony; and here we have the positive testimony of twice as many Greek Mss. as retain our reading of 1 John iii. 16. Let us proceed to the author *De Trinitate*. He five times quotes the verse, if we may trust some of the editions. I say, if we may trust the editions; because the quotation at the end of the first book, and another in the fifth, are neither in the old Paris nor Cologne editions. And whoever will carefully peruse the context, will perceive, that in both places the sense is much better connected, if we adopt the shorter reading, and the parts that were before separated close without leaving a scar. The same hand without doubt interpolated both the passages, as appears from the phrase with which he introduces them. "I. Jam audisti superius Evangelistam Joannem in epistola sua tam absolute testantem. V. Sicut Joannes Evangelista in epistola sua tam absolute testatur." In the tenth book too I am almost afraid that some malicious hand has been tampering; for the words of the first book are

¹ Vigili Tapsensis Vindiciæ, p. 64—68.

exactly repeated, "In Christo Jesu unum sunt, non tamen unus est, quia non est eorum una persona." However, I shall not insist on this point, but allow both to be genuine, if you desire it. I shall only object, that the author has been inaccurate (to use no harsher word), and by substituting in *Christo Jesu unum sunt* for *tres unum sunt*, has given reasonable cause for suspicion. Perhaps, Sir, you may ask, why I think the passages above-mentioned spurious. First, for the reason already given, that in such passages additions are much more frequent than omissions; secondly, because the following subscription is added at the end of the eighth book in two Mss. one of which I have seen. "I have transcribed these eight books, which contain many things added and altered." I should think it an affront to my reader's understanding to say another word on the subject.

I did expect that Martin would have applied another quotation from Vigilius to his argument. "Qui faciendum decernunt (hominem) *tres sunt, Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus; sed hi tres unus est.*" (Martin translates, *these three are one*, Exam. c. 4.) I think this would make as good a figure as many of your witnesses. I only mention it to show how easily men writing on the Trinity may drop expressions, which a warm imagination might easily mistake for a reference to the verse of St. John.

I have already, Letter VI. p. 74. quoted 1 John v. 8, 7. as they are read in the treatise against Varimadus, i. 5. If a citation so manifestly fraudulent can be of any service, you are heartily welcome to it. For my own part, I think it argument enough against a suspected text, that they who make most use of it cannot agree in the reading. However, being willing to vindicate this author, I must declare, that I believe this quotation not to have come from his hand. First, I observe that the whole chapter consists of quotations to prove the unity of the Son with the Father. This is the only quotation that he brings from the epistle, though he brings eight from the gospel. And since the objection, which he professes to answer, was taken from the gospel, he seems to have made a point of conscience not to depart from the gospel in his answer. If it be objected, that he might quote this passage as an argument *a fortiori*, I answer, that he would then probably have used such a preface as he uses in his second chapter, entitled, De Unitate Patris et Filii. Quoting Eph. iv. 3. he thus introduces it: "Et unitatem Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti demonstrans."

Secondly, the first chapter of the first book contains the positive proofs of the Trinity in Unity. These proofs are twenty-two in number, among which are Matt. xxviii. 19. Rom. xi. 35. 2 Cor. xiii. 13. But of the three heavenly witnesses a deep silence. Surely, if he had forgotten them when he wrote his first chapter, and afterwards recollected them in the fifth, he would not have

grudged turning back a few pages to insert them in a more proper place.

Thirdly, his last book is a collection of passages from scripture, where the same things are predicated of all the persons of the Trinity. The sixty-fifth chapter is entitled, *De communi Testificatione*, which he proves from Psalm xviii. 8. 1 Tim. vi. 13. Rom. viii. 16. Compare also the nineteenth chapter of the first book. But how much more pat would this verse have been, if he had known of it! If such a verse existed, he must have known of it, for in this very book he quotes the sixth, the tenth, the twelfth, and twentieth verses of the same fifth chapter.¹

I therefore make no doubt but that the heavenly and earthly witnesses were inserted in this treatise by that religious soul who forged the decretal epistle of Hyginus.² This forger has taken all the quotations preceding 1 John v. 8, 7. (except one) from our author, preserving the same order. But in return for the loan of so many quotations, he paid him with this text, which shows his scrupulous honesty. The same quotations may also be found in the decretal epistle of Pope John.³ But in Pope John the present reading of the eighth and seventh verses is restored. As I shall be glad to make some amends to my author for having robbed him of so much text, and as nothing is so pleasant to a critic as correcting a classic, I shall add, that instead of "*Qui me vidit, vidit et Patrem*," ought to be read, on the authority of Hyginus, "*Qui me vidit, vidit et Patrem; et iterum, Qui me odit, odit et Patrem*." The omission was caused by the similar terminations. I suppose I need make no apologies to Pseudo-Hyginus. Whoever would forge a whole treatise, would hardly stick at the addition of a single sentence. Martin, in the simplicity of his heart, quotes Hyginus and John for good authorities. I know, says he, that their epistles are spurious, but they prove what was the reading of their times. I know too that the authority of forgers can never support a doubtful reading, unless it be their interest rather to reject than adopt it. However, I allow that they prove such a reading to have existed in their times, that is, in the eighth century. Nor am I quite sure that the author of Pope John's epistle did not compose the prologue attributed to Jerome. I perceive that you, Sir, have not appealed to these illustrious witnesses, Hyginus and John. If this was the effect of design, I commend your prudence.

¹ In Sirmond's Works, vol. i. p. 377—400. is an anonymous treatise, entitled, *Breviarium Fidei adversus Arianos*; the author of which borrows the substance of great part of the third book, with additions, transpositions, and alterations; but he too is silent on the text of the three heavenly witnesses.

² Harduin. Concil. tom. i. p. 94. This Hyginus seems to have given Mr. Capel Lofft (*Animadv. on Dr. Knowles*) much trouble.

³ Harduin. Concil. tom. ii. p. 1154.

Of Fulgentius I have already spoken in part. If you object, that though he refers to Cyprian in one place, which may seem to hint that the state of Mss. made such a reference necessary, in another passage he quotes 1 John v. 7. without suspicion, I answer, that this will not prove that Fulgentius had better authority in one instance than in the other. I remember that Mr. Jones, in his Full Answer to an Essay on Spirit, Pref. p. xix. quotes 1 John v. 7. without suspicion, and from that and John x. 30. charges the author whom he is answering with blasphemy. Should we not think that for such a purpose none but certain and acknowledged texts would be quoted? Yet the same gentleman, in his Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, ch. iii. § 10. confesses that there has been much dispute concerning this text, and adds his own reasons for believing it genuine. The same answer will serve for the other quotations, if they belong to Fulgentius; if not, the anonymous author would borrow them from Fulgentius, the reigning polemic of the day.

Cassiodorus in the sixth century wrote his *Complexiones*, a sort of abridgment of the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse. These *Complexiones* were found by Maffei in the library of Verona, and by him published at Florence in 1721, and by Chandler at London in 1722. Chandler, Pref. p. ix. after observing that the contested verse was in some Latin copies at least of the sixth century, in the next page grows diffident, and says, that it is uncertain whether Cassiodorus has given us the very words of the apostle, or only his own interpretation. This scepticism provoked the gentle Maffei to treat Chandler very roughly in his *Istoria Diplomatica* and his *Opuscoli Ecclesiastici*. Let us therefore examine the words of Cassiodorus in a literal translation: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God, &c. He who believes Jesus to be God, is born of God the Father; he without doubt is faithful, and he who loves the Father, loves also the Christ who is born of him. Now we so love him, when we keep his commandments, which to just minds are not heavy; but they rather overcome the world, when they believe in him who created the world. To which thing witness on earth three mysteries, the water, the blood, and the spirit, which were fulfilled, we read, in the passion of the Lord; but in heaven the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and these three is one God."

It is incumbent on them who are positive that Cassiodorus had the heavenly witnesses in his copy, to tell us under what form they appeared. This verse has the misfortune to be always changing shapes. But it is all one to the defenders. So it be in the text, they care not. I would gladly learn, however, whether Cassiodorus found the eighth verse before the seventh; whether he found the earthly witnesses in the same order that he has followed; whether his copy had *Filius* instead of *Verbum*; whether *tres*

sunt in cælo instead of *tres sunt qui testimonium dant i. c.*; whether it omitted the final clause of the eighth verse; and, lastly, whether its reading was, *hi tres unum sunt*, or *hi tres unus est Deus*. Be assured, Sir, that these questions must receive a satisfactory answer, before Cassiodorus's testimony will avail you. Where some of the ancient Mss. totally omit a passage, the change of its situation, and the variety of its readings, in others, always render it suspicious, and often demonstrate it to be spurious. Martin himself was aware of this; for in his *Verité*, p. 62. having occasion to mention the author against Varimadus, he quotes the eighth verse no farther than to the words *in terra*, and smothers the rest with an *etcætera*.

Omnis qui credit quoniam Jesus est Christus, &c. says St. John. *Qui Deum Jesum credit*, says Cassiodorus. If from this interpretation *Deus* had crept into the Latin copies, with what pious wrath and obstinacy would it have been defended! We should be told of Cassiodorus's diligent study of the scriptures; his taste and nicety in choosing the best readings; his painful collation of Greek Mss. and I know not what. Soon after, Cassiodorus adds, "*quando in illum credunt, qui condidit mundum.*" Where are the last words? Not in our present copies, but in that accurate collator's Greek Mss. Let us then read in our present first verse, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is God," and in the fifth, "Who conquereth the world, but he who believeth in him who created the world?" A choice voucher for a doubtful text! What you say of Greek Mss. amounts to nothing. Cassiodorus does not play the critic in his *Complexiones*, and consequently there was no need of his Greek learning. Or suppose that he sometimes followed the Greek, if one clear proof can be produced, that ever he followed the Latin in opposition to the Greek, this plea is of no weight. (See 1 Pet. iii. 22.)

On a diligent examination of the *Complexiones*, I am persuaded that Cassiodorus found no more than these words in his copy, *Tres sunt qui testificantur, aqua, et sanguis, et spiritus, et hi tres unum sunt*. That he gave his own, or rather Eucherius's interpretation of these words, and applied them to the Trinity. Why else should he use the emphatic word *mysteria*, unless he intended to make some mystical application? Since he interprets *spiritus* of the human breath, what mystery, what hidden sense, do these three words contain of themselves? But let us suppose that he understood the passage in this manner: "Which is witnessed by three things on earth, the water, blood, and spirit. These were visibly fulfilled in the passion of our Lord, but they are mysteries which spiritually represent the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in heaven, of whom it may be truly said, these three are one, that is, one God." This reason will account for his keeping back the clause, *hi tres unum sunt*, and confining it to its uobler sense.

This will also account for his arranging the witnesses in the same order with Eucherius, so that the water may answer to the Father, the blood to the Son, and the Spirit remain in statu quo. Nor is it strange that Eucherius's works, and consequently this interpretation, should visit Ravenna in the intermediate hundred and forty years that passed between the publication of the *Quæstiones* and *Complexiones*. But perhaps you will like Cassiodorus's own positive testimony better than my presumption. Well, Sir, I will please you if I can. In the tenth chapter of his *Divinæ Lectiones*, the title of which is *De Modis Intelligentiæ*, he expressly says that he has collected Eucherius's works. And since he collected them for the sake of their explanations of scripture, he would probably adopt this allegory among other profitable remarks.

Cassiodorus thus explains 1 John ii. 13, 14. "I write to you; because ye have overcome the devil, and have known God the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost." Can we suppose that Cassiodorus would thus interpret the single word *God*? No, he found it in his Latin Mss. and not only in his Latin, but his Greek; and his Greek cannot be supposed later than the apostolic age. Let us therefore restore, on the uncorrupt faith of Cassiodorus and his Greek Mss., the true reading; *Γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρα, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε Θεὸν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα*. There are several other places in the N. T. where the true reading has been hitherto shamefully neglected.

Matth. vi. 13. has been already mentioned.

John xviii. 32. two Mss. in Wetstein's list have preserved the true reading, *That the word of God might be fulfilled, which he spake, signifying by what death he should die*.

John xix. 40. the Alexandrian Ms. reads, *the body of God*, which is no less true and certain than *the blood of God*, Acts xx. 28.

Acts xiii. 41. a Ms. of New College, Oxford, rightly adds, *that God is crucified, and dies*.

1 Cor. v. 7. *Christ God our passover was sacrificed for us*. So it ought to be read from Hippolytus, a Ms. collated by Mr. Matthæi, and a Ms. of Chrysostome, and the Lateran Council, as I learn from Wetstein, on Acts xx. 28.

2 Thess. ii. 16. a Ms. collated by Zacagni preserves the true reading; *Now our Lord and God Jesus Christ himself, &c*. From these examples, I hope, it will appear, how falsely that infamous villain Erasmus asserted that Christ is seldom called God in the N. T.

But we need go no farther than our own fifth chapter of St. John to show how the text has been mutilated. The genuine reading of the twentieth verse is this: *And we know that the Son of God is come [and was incarnate for our sake, and suffered, and rose from the dead, and took us up], and hath given us an understanding, &c*. The words between brackets (or something like them)

are quoted by Hilary, by Faustinus, and the author against Vari-
madus. They are also in the Toledo Ms. collated by Blanchini,
and in three others that I myself have seen. Another shameful
mutilation of this chapter will occur presently.

From Cassiodorus we jump two centuries to come to your next
author, Ambrose Authpert, or Ansbert, or Autpert, (as I find him
called in a Ms.) who, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse,
twice quotes the heavenly witnesses. Nobody denies that some
Latin copies had this verse in the eighth century. It is then that
we suppose it to have crawled into notice on the strength of
Pseudo-Jerome's recommendation. Autpert also quotes the tenth
verse with a considerable various reading; "And this is the wit-
ness of God that he hath testified of his Son [whom he hath sent
a saviour on earth]."¹ This addition I should not hesitate to re-
store to the text, unless those illustrious defenders of the faith,
Etherius and Beatus, supplied me with something better. For
thus they quote a part of 1 John v. *Quia tres sunt qui testimonium
dant in terris, aqua, sanguis, et caro, et tria hæc unum sunt, et
tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiri-
tus, et hæc tria unum sunt in Christo Jesu. Si testimonium ho-
minum accipimus, testimonium Dei majus est; et hoc est testimo-
nium Dei, quod testificatus est de Filio suo, [quem misit salvatorem
super terram, et Filius testimonium perhibuit inter scripturas
proficiens, et nos testimonium perhibemus, quoniam videmus eum
et annunciamus vobis, ut credatis. Et ideo] qui credit, &c.*
What a dainty morsel of scripture had the heretics cut away,
because, I suppose, it was meat too strong for their sickly sto-
machs! Let it be immediately restored to the rank from which it
has been so long and so unjustly degraded. First, however, let
us wash off a little dirt which it has contracted during its disgrace,
that it may be fit to see company. "Inter scripturas proficiens"
is neither Latin nor sense. To the immortal honor of true criti-
cism, I retrieved the genuine reading by conjecture, *in terra scrip-
turas proficiens*, which I afterwards found confirmed by the Toledo
Ms. of the Vulgate, of which Blanchini has inserted a collation in
his *Vindiciæ Veteris Vulgatæ*.²

"Walafrid Strabo" (rather Strabus), "author of the *Glossa Or-
dinaria*, comments on this verse." Since we allow this verse to
have been in some copies of the eighth century, we suppose it to be
in more of the ninth. Walafrid might therefore comment on it,
especially as his scruples, if he had any, would be silenced or
satisfied by the fictitious Prologue. You believe that Walafrid
consulted Greek Mss., and Greek Mss. too as old as the fifth cen-
tury, because he says, that wherever the vulgar text of the Old

¹ I am obliged to trust to memory.

² See both the quotations in Wetstein, tom. ii. p. 725, 726.

Testament was faulty, the Hebrew Mss. ought to be consulted; wherever of the New, the Greek. I could prove many of the most illiterate peasants to be proficient in Greek by the same rule, for they would tell you, that where the translation is wrong or obscure, the originals ought to be examined. But if this argument proves Walafrid to have collated Greek Mss. to the N. T. it proves him equally to have collated Hebrew Mss. to the Old. First, therefore, show that Walafrid understood Greek and Hebrew. Next produce a competent number of examples, where Walafrid compares the various readings of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew Mss. and sits in judgment on their merits. You say, p. 324. "Walafrid directs his readers, in all cases of difficulty, to resort to the Greek copies, which implies that to be his constant practice." Admirable! Theodore Beza wishes that editors would publish all the various readings of their Mss.¹ which implies that he has suppressed none of his own. Mr. Travis is very bitter against sophistry, unfair quotation, fraud, and forgery, which implies that he himself is perfectly free from all such peccadilloes. Many thousands of divines once a week (or oftener) teach the doctrines of religion and the duties of morality, which implies their steadfast belief of the one, and their constant practice of the other.

Your inference from Walafrid's advice is caught up by your friend above quoted, p. 322. who says² that "Walafrid Strabo professes to have consulted the most ancient Greek Mss." I only mention this to show how readily men will assert the most palpable falsehoods, and how a story gains strength by travelling. Though you allow that both the Syriac and Coptic versions omit the disputed verse, this gentleman asserts that it is wanting in none but the Coptic. Another direct falsehood; which either proves that he has lost all sense of shame, or that he has not read your book with moderate attention.

The rabble of witnesses that you bring after the tenth century deserves no attention. If you could make them ten times as many, their joint authority would be a "broken reed, on which if a man lean, it shall go into his hand, and pierce it." I freely, therefore, give you Rodolph, Rupert, Bernard, Victorinus, Lombard, Aquinas, Scotus, Lyranus, and as many more as you can muster.

From Durandus you infer that the three heavenly witnesses were in the *Ordo Romanus*. This *Ordo* was composed about the year 730. Allowing therefore that it contained this verse, it would prove little. But Durandus, by quoting the verse from the *Ordo Romanus* of his time, will not prove that it was extant there from the first compilation. None of the adversaries deny (so far as I know) that it had been in quiet possession of almost all the Mss.

¹ Wetstein, *Proleg.* p. 148.

² *Vindication of the Liturgy*, &c. p. 48.

from the year 1000. The alterations of the liturgy would keep pace with the improvements made in the other copies, and sometimes outrun them. Or, if they did not, the heads of the church would perhaps have sent an order to this effect:¹ “Scribatur in textu Joannis Epistolæ ubi deest, *Tres sunt qui testimonium*,” &c.

“The deference,” say you, “yielded to the known learning and integrity of the Lateran council, caused its decrees, in matters even of a secular nature, to be received as law, not only in England,” &c. Though this proves nothing in favor of the verse, it proves two other points. That the clergy then exercised dominion over the rights of mankind, and that able tithe-lawyers often make sorry critics. Which I desire some certain gentlemen of my acquaintance to lay up in their hearts as a very seasonable inuendo.

To your list of Latin witnesses you ought to have added three more, which Maffei found in the library of Verona. The first is a dialogue, not much differing from that which is published in Athanasius's works; the second, Athanasius's commentary on the creed; the third, a book *De Divinis Officiis*, which couples Matt. xxviii. 19. 1 John v. 7. In the commentary on the creed, which Blanchini² published, or in Blanchini's notes, that passage, I doubt not, occurred, which Wetstein has quoted, and Mr. Griesbach professes himself unable to find. That author thus quotes Matt. xxviii. 19. “*Ite, baptizate gentes, ungentes eos*,” &c. Here we have a scriptural precept for the use of the chrism in baptism, which has now been for ages neglected, to the utter perdition of many souls. But of all writers that have quoted the verse in question, the writer of the *Sermones Dormi Secure* (V. near the end, de conceptione Mariæ) makes the most curious application of it. “Unde bene dicitur illud j. Jo. v. *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant, scilicet Virgini Mariæ, quod sit sine originali. Et Daniel iij. Hii tres quasi ex uno ore laudabant Deum; scilicet quod matrem suam præservavit ab originali.*” I hope you will enrich your next edition with these fresh testimonies, which will make your work complete and consistent.

POSTSCRIPT.

I know that the right of Walafrid Strabus to the Preface and the *Glossa Ordinaria* is exceedingly questionable; but I have allowed it, that the dispute might be cut somewhat shorter.

¹ See Letter IX. p. 205. of Class. Journ.

² Ut ostendi in Enarratione Pseudo-Athanasiana in Symbolum, quam Veronæ edidi. Evangeliar. Quadrupl. Part i. p. 90.

LETTER XII.

Of the Greek and Latin writers, who, though they had sufficient occasion, have not quoted the verse. Recapitulation and conclusion.

Sir,

THE Greek and Latin authors that cannot be persuaded to quote the three heavenly witnesses are so fairly enumerated by Mill; Emlyn, Wetstein, Newton, and others, that I shall do little more than repeat their list, and add such remarks as may seem most necessary.

GREEK AUTHORS.

Irenæus.	Cyril of Alexandria.
Clemens Alexandrinus.	The Exposition of Faith in Justin
Dionysius Alexandrinus (or the	Martyr's works.
writer against Paul of Samosata	Cæsarius.
under his name).	Proclus.
Athanasius.	The Council of Nice, as it is re-
The Synopsis of Scripture.	presented by Gelasius Cyzicenus.
The Synod of Sardica.	Hippolytus.
Epiphanius.	Andreas.
Basil.	Six catenæ quoted by Simon.
Alexander of Alexandria.	The marginal scholia of three
Gregory Nyssen.	Mss.
Gregory Nazianzen, with his	Hesychius.
two commentators, Elias Cretensis	John Damascenus.
and Nicetas.	Germanus of Constantinople.
Didymus de Spiritu sancto.	Œcumenius.
Chrysostome.	Euthymius Zigabenus.
An author under his name De	
sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate.	

LATIN AUTHORS.

The author de Baptismo Hæreticorum among Cyprian's works.	Eucherius.
Novatian.	Facundus.
Hilary.	Junilius.
Lucifer Calaritanus.	Cerealis.
Jerome.	Rusticus.
Augustine.	Bede.
Ambrose.	Gregory.
Faustinus.	Philastrius.
Leo Magnus.	Paschasius.
The author de Promissis.	Arnobius junior.
	Pope Eusebius.

This evidence, which might seem to a common understanding to form a strong negative, you waggishly call a "region of night and nothing," and to guide us through this region with safety and dispatch you lay down two rules; 1. that some of these writers might have quoted the verse in other works of theirs now lost; 2. that when any of them neglect another passage confessedly genuine and equally fit for their purpose, their omission of this

verse does not prove it to be spurious or unknown to them. But this accumulation of possibilities is useless and sophistical. It is indeed possible that a writer may forget or neglect to urge one of his best arguments; but that so many authors, with such repeated opportunities, should all agree in shutting their eyes against the light of this marvellous passage, is improbable, incredible, impossible.

Let any unprejudiced man conceive this verse to be generally read and admitted for genuine, and then let him conceive, if he can, that all the defenders of the Trinity could preserve an obstinate silence, and never appeal to it. But how will he bring himself to conceive such an absurdity, if he has been at all conversant with modern divinity? No text has been so often quoted, since its establishment in our printed editions; none so readily applied to the Trinity, of which it is almost always declared to be a complete and formal proof. It is, in short, the very soul of modern controversy, "*tota in toto et tota in qualibet parte.*"

But you see clearly enough the insufficiency of these two reasons, and therefore call to your aid a third, that "some of the Fathers" (who have not quoted the verse), "perhaps all of them, conceived the words of this verse to indicate a unity of consent only, and not a unity of nature." To make this more likely, you jocularly quote Calvin and Beza, who explain in this manner the clause *unum sunt*. Dr. Horsley indeed says (Tracts, p. 345.) that many of the orthodox (to whom he adds himself) are of the same opinion. As far as I can judge, these milder and pretended orthodox are so few, that if the more zealous Christians were divided into companies of ten, and every one of their lukewarm brethren waited on a company, "many decads would go without a cupbearer." I shall produce a few of these testimonies, as they lie before me. Martin earnestly insists, in the beginning of his *Verité*, on the great importance of this passage, and calls it "the strongest weapon that we can employ against the Arians." "Were there," says Atterbury, "no other text for the proof of the doctrine of the holy Trinity—but that only—where St. John speaks of the three witnesses in heaven, it would be sufficient to make that doctrine an evident part of scripture; though in all the other passages usually produced for it, it should be allowed to be expressed obscurely." Allen, Sermon i. p. 22. says, with infinite candor, "Very probably (the Arians) forged other Mss. and in them wilfully omitted this verse of St. John, that so they might in some measure at least invalidate and weaken the authority of a text, which was directly opposite to their false doctrines, and which it was utterly impossible to evade the force of by any artificial and unnatural constructions." Snape, Sermon. viii. p. 50: "That he is one and the same God with the Father and the Son, is declared by St. John in express terms; *There are three,*" &c. Felton, Moyer's

Lectures vii. p. 368 : "The doctrine cannot be expressed in fewer or clearer words." Beveridge, *Private Thoughts*, ii. p. 40 : "And yet that all these three persons were but one God, St. John expressly asserts, saying, &c. which certainly are as plain and perspicuous terms as it is possible to express so great a mystery in." If, therefore, we may judge from the analogy of modern times, the number of those squeamish Fathers, who would scruple to employ this text, would be trifling, compared with the bolder warriors who would draw it as the sharpest arrow from their quiver. But the mild interpretations of Calvin and Beza prove nothing concerning the Fathers. Modern expositors have deserted many passages which the ancients applied to the Trinity. Calvin's example is the less to the purpose, because he has been accused by his brethren of explaining away some of the capital texts. For instance, *I and my Father are one*, he explains of a unity of consent. But what a host of Fathers quote the same verse, without fear or scruple against the heretics, to prove the deity of the Son ! Let us suppose that a great number of our Greek Mss. omitted John x. 30. and that some of the most renowned, orthodox, and voluminous Fathers never quoted it, who sees not the obvious and natural conclusion, that the verse was unknown in their age ? It would be an absurd fancy to think that they might have quoted this verse in other works ; that they might omit it, because they have omitted others ; or that perhaps they conceived it not to prove a unity of essence.

Besides, there was another reason for Calvin's and Beza's moderation. They knew the precarious tenure by which this verse held its place, and it would have seemed inconsistent to lay any stress on the orthodox inferences that might be drawn from a suspected testimony. You will forgive me, too, if I hint, that some of those who affect to adopt Calvin's exposition, imitate *Æsop's fox*, and call the grapes sour, because they cannot reach them.

But, Sir, if any of the Fathers thus explained away the substantiality of the heavenly witnesses, produce an example or two from their works. Let us have no conjectures. If you can find one ancient author, Greek or Latin, who has thus betrayed the citadel to his enemies, you will not only have a positive argument on your side, but a plausible objection to that ungracious negative. But this, Sir, you cannot perform, I fear. Your Jerome says ; that this verse is the "chief strength" of the Catholic faith. Why then does not he inculcate it perpetually, in season and out of season ? Authpert twice quotes it, without any particular necessity. Such silence then in the other Fathers is unaccountable. If they had really thought that the clause *tres unum sunt* meant only unity of consent, still the passage must have claimed their attention, because it is one of the few where the three divine persons are connumerated distinctly and in order.

The greater part of mankind quotes scripture more by sound than sense. They take every detached sentence for a distinct assertion or apophthegm, and apply it according to its apparent meaning, after they have forcibly torn it from its context. Though a temperate critic might, from a diligent examination of the Apostle's argument, be induced to doubt whether the one essence of the Trinity was here intended, how few of such critics were in the primitive church, and how few are in our own! The bulk at least would lay violent hands on the verse, and cry it up for a decisive testimony. You say, that "through the vast series of one thousand four hundred years, not a single author, whether Patripassian, Cerinthian, Ebionite, Arian, Macedonian, or Sabellian, &c. has ever taxed the various quotations of this verse with interpolation or forgery." You have read, I presume, a competent number of the works of these heretics. You have read some which were written expressly in answer to those treatises that employ the three heavenly witnesses. If you have, Sir, be so good as to inform us where they may be found. Surely, Sir, you did not believe that this argument was of any weight, even while you wrote it down. I know only of one heretic, Abbot Joachim, who has quoted the verse; and he lived when by the unanimous confession of all parties it had been long read in the Latin version. Your reasoning, therefore, amounts to this: Either the heretics published answers to the orthodox writers who quote 1 John v. 7. or they did not. If they published no answers, they certainly made no objection to the authenticity of that verse. If they published any answers, those answers are now lost; and still, as far as we know, no objection has been made to the verse. What an excellent judge Mr. Travis is of a negative argument!

You perceive, however, at last, that the negative argument is of some weight, and therefore you suppose that the verse was partially lost in some part of the interval between the years 101 and 384. You had better correct a little, and suppose that it was entirely omitted in St. John's autograph. This will solve all difficulties much better, take my word for it. I always thought that when a great number of Mss. of an ancient author omit any passage, on which the intermediate writers, who on other occasions freely quote that author's works, are quite silent; though the passage be very fit for their subject; though they quote other passages much less apposite; though they quote so near it that they could not help seeing it, if it were extant; though sometimes they quote the words that precede, and the words that follow; even though they extract from the next words with great labor and difficulty the very sense which this passage would furnish at a much easier and cheaper rate; I always thought that, in such a case, the plain reason of these omissions of the Fathers was a total absence of the passage from their copies, and a total ignorance of its existence,

But, according to you, omissions are no proof against a verse, where there is positive proof for it. I ask, then, how much positive proof is necessary? Is any text genuine that may be found in the Latin version, or in a few Greek Mss. provided no actual charge of forgery be brought against it? If this be your opinion (as it seems to be), you need not be afraid of being confuted, for nobody will dispute with you. If our Greek Mss. unanimously retained this verse, while the Fathers were silent on it, this dissent might leave us in an unpleasant state of doubt and suspense. But when the Fathers and Greek Mss. so exactly agree in rejecting a text, to adopt any other reason than the obvious fact, the spuriousness of the passage, is to set aside all evidence, for the sole end of maintaining this judicious paradox, that the worse Latin copies have preserved the genuine reading.

You make exceptions to some of the particular Fathers who have not quoted this verse. You say, that neither Alexander of Alexandria, nor Eusebius in his tract against the Sabellians, nor Gregory Nazianzen in his treatise on the Divinity of Christ, nor Epiphanius against Noetus, citès Matt. xxviii. 19. But Alexander quotes John x. 30. to which 1 John v. 7. would have been an admirable parallel. If by Eusebius's tract against the Sabellians you mean the three books *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*, there is an express quotation of it in one, and a plain reference to it in another of those books. If Gregory Nazianzen does not quote the form of baptism in the oration that you have named, he quotes it as a strong proof of the Trinity in his forty-ninth oration, where he also quotes John x. 30. Now, since 1 John v. 7. unites in itself the merits of both those passages, it is strange that Gregory should never think of quoting it, he who had in his thirty-sixth oration mentioned the other three witnesses, *the spirit, the water, and the blood*. If Epiphanius does not quote Matth. xxviii. 19. against Noetus, how often does he quote it elsewhere! You add, that the Synopsis may with great probability be ascribed to Athanasius, and that it plainly refers to the verse in question. I answer, 1. that the Synopsis is certainly spurious; and, 2. that it contains not the slightest vestige of the verse, but expressly quotes ii. 23. to show the unity of the Father with the Son. This I have proved at large, Letter IX. p. 197, 198. And now let any man consider with himself, whether Athanasius, who frequently and repeatedly cites Matth. xxviii. 19. John x. 30. and even the twentieth verse of our fifth chapter, could be so blind or negligent as to pass over such an important text. This verse would have been very commodious to prove the deity of the Son, the deity of the Holy Ghost, or the joint deity of the three persons. But neither Athanasius, nor Didymus, nor the two Gregories, nor Basil, nor Cyril, though they have all largely written on these subjects, have paid any regard to the celestial testimony. The second person of the Trinity is here more

clearly called the Logos, than even in the beginning of the Gospel. How has it happened that no ancient writer whatever quotes the verse for this title, though they make several fantastical applications of texts that are nothing to the purpose? You will hardly, Sir, I guess, prefer the other reading, *Filius*, which is in a few Latin and some French Mss. in Wickliffe's translation; in a Ms. of Victor, and in Bernard. For if you allow that *Filius* is the genuine reading, *Verbum* must have been a most impudent forgery, and the credit of the Latin copies will be demolished at a blow. But taking *Verbum* for genuine, I can see only one reason (which I leave Mr. Travis to find out) why this verse is never quoted to show that Christ is called *the Word*.

What a difference in value between the eighth and seventh verses! Yet the eighth is often quoted, the seventh scarcely ever. How wonderful it is that the authors who quote the eighth verse should never turn a little out of their way, allured by the charms of the seventh! We have seen the Armenian council three times quoting the seventh verse, not because the subject which they were treating required it, but merely in compliment to its extraordinary beauty and merit. If any of the authors now extant, who quote the eighth verse, had ever quoted the seventh, in defence of the Trinity, they surely would have repeated it, if it were only for the sake of old acquaintance.

Cyril quoting the sixth, eighth, and ninth verses, argues that, because the Spirit is said to witness, and this witness is called the witness of God, therefore the Spirit is God. But insert the seventh verse, and this argument is spoiled. For the witness of God is sufficiently marked out by the witness of the Father, a heretic would answer, without extending the word God either to the Word or the Spirit.

But the strongest proof that this verse is spurious may be drawn from the Epistle of Leo the Great to Flavianus on the Incarnation. This epistle has been translated into Greek, read in churches, sent round to the councils both in the East and West, defended by several authors in set treatises, and consequently more generally known than most of the writings of the Fathers. In this epistle he quotes part of the fifth chapter, from the fourth to the eighth verse, and omits the three heavenly witnesses. John Moschus informs us, in his *Spiritual Meadow*,¹ that he was told by Abbot Menas, who was told by Abbot Eulogius, who was told by Archdeacon Gregory, that the Roman church had a written tradition, that Pope Leo, when he had finished his letter to Flavianus against Eutyches and Nestorius, laid it on the tomb of the foreman of the apostles, Peter, and besought him to correct it, wherever it was erroneous or imperfect. After he had prayed, fasted, and lain on the ground,

¹ Cotelier. Eccles. Græc. Monum. tom. ii. p. 416.

a decent time (about forty days; for the apostle was somewhat shy, like Milton's Eve, "Who would be wooed, and not unsought be won"), Peter appeared to him, and said, "I have read and corrected;" on which Leo takes the letter from the tomb, opens it, and finds that the apostle had been as good as his word. On this authentic fact I shall make a few remarks. Peter could not be ignorant of the existence of this verse, if it were genuine. We may reasonably suppose his faculties to be so far improved in heaven, that he remembered all the N. T. Or if by chance he had forgotten this epistle of St. John, or this part of it, the author was at hand to set him right; "for it is impossible to suppose that St. Peter would not in such an undertaking constantly confer with such a neighbor, with such a friend, with such a man, as St. John."¹ He must therefore have foreseen what untoward consequences the heretics would draw, if the seventh verse were omitted in Leo's epistle, and would have certainly replaced it, if it were genuine. But by suffering the omission to pass uncorrected, we may be sure that St. Peter thought the verse spurious, or that it did not then exist. From this conclusion there is no escaping, but by a denial of the fact, and that would be to introduce a universal Pyrrhonism into history.

The only Greek evidence, earlier than the thirteenth century, that even seems to be in your favor, is the dialogue published with Athanasius. That dialogue quotes and applies to the Trinity these words, *And the three are one*. The Greek words literally agree with the reading of the eighth verse in the French king's Ms. No. 60. *Kal oi tpeis rò èv elain*. And since the marginal note on that clause is in the Ms. *one God, one godhead*, it need not be doubted but that the author of the dialogue meant to give the same interpretation.

You quarrel with us for urging the negative testimony of Bede and Oecumenius, while we reject Victor's for being too late. I will endeavor, Sir, to explain this matter. An important and curious passage of scripture ought to be quoted by a reasonable proportion of the writers of every succeeding age. But if either through fraud or by chance, a spurious sentence is inserted into some copies of scripture, though from the general propensity of transcribers the number of interpolated Mss. may be daily increased, yet several ages must elapse before a general corruption can take place. It has however at last happened, in some places, that the corrupted copies have almost swallowed up the others. In this case, if we can find that such a passage was unknown to an author of the later ages, it is so far from being a prejudice against him, that he lived so late, that he is a stronger testimony against the addition, because he shows that some uncorrupted copies remained, even after the inter-

¹ Mr. Travis uses these words of Crispin and Stephens, p. 58. 123.

polation had been making its way for so many centuries. If, therefore, Bede was ignorant of this verse, since Bede was a good judge of the state of Latin Mss. in his time, it will follow that the Latin copies of the eighth century generally omitted it; which is otherwise probable, because most Latin Mss. of that and the ninth centuries omit it. If Œcumenius and Euthymius Zigabenus knew nothing of the verse, it will follow that the Greek Mss. of the eleventh and twelfth centuries omitted it.

I am willing to suppose that Bede had no Greek Mss. except to the Acts. But if he had a Greek Ms. of the Catholic epistles, which wanted the three heavenly witnesses, he could not tell us of the omission of them, unless he knew of their existence in the Latin. You therefore modestly assume, that since the verse was in Jerome's version, it must have been in Bede's copy. How often shall we be favored with this piece of sophistry? This passage was in Jerome's version; therefore Bede knew of it. I should think, Sir, this argument more agreeable to logic: The copies of Jerome's version vary; some retaining, some omitting the passage; Bede makes no mention of it; therefore Bede used a copy that omitted the passage. Next you tell us, from Martin, that Bede must have known of this text from Cyprian, Fulgentius, and the confession in Victor; all of whom he has quoted. With respect to Cyprian, he might not know to what place of scripture Cyprian referred; or he might think with Facundus that Cyprian interpreted the eighth verse. With respect to Victor and Fulgentius, if he knew nothing of the verse when he read their works, he was not obliged to record for quotations of scripture passages which he did not know to be in scripture. If he thought they were guilty of a pious fraud, was he blamable for not imitating them? This objection supposes that Bede took the trouble to examine critically every text quoted by Fulgentius and Victor. A pleasant task you would impose on the poor man! Why, Sir, when you took on trust, from Martin, your charges against the Syriac and Coptic versions, you are conscious that you did not examine a single reference. And yet I apprehend this was a duty incumbent on you, though Bede was bound by no tie of conscience to hunt after the various quotations produced by his authors.

But if any person will read through Bede's commentary on the fifth chapter, he must see, unless he be wilfully blind, that Bede was totally ignorant of the seventh verse. He is so minute and exact, that he has transcribed the whole text, except two or three words at the end of one verse, and even those he inserts in his commentary. If after all this you insist that he might know of the verse, I can think of no proof that would settle the point, except an actual assurance of Bede's innocence under his own hand. Perhaps Bede ought to have used such language as this: "N.B. I have never heard of an additional set of witnesses, nor ever was

them in any copy." Let it be added, that Bede was zealously orthodox, as appears from his hymn on St. Edeldrida, H. E. iv. 20. "Alma Deus Trinitas, qui secula cuncta gubernas, Annue jam cœptis, alma Deus Trinitas."¹ And on this very chapter he breaks out, "Perent de terra memoria eorum, qui eum vel Deum vel hominem esse verum denegant."

Newton had suspected that the words *in terra* were not written by Bede, because he so particularly explains the rest of the verse, without taking any notice of them. Erasmus had already observed that a Ms. omitted these words, though a much later hand had added in the margin the three heavenly witnesses. What pity that such a copy did not come into the hands of the first editor, that Bede might have been a voucher for the verse! Emlyn tells us, on hearsay, that the Mss. of Bede omitted *in terra*. Martin answered, that he had seen those words with his own eyes in a Ms. at Utrecht. I fully believe this assertion; for I myself have seen them in a Ms. at Oxford, but very modern, and of little value. All the other ten that I collated omit *in terra*, without any rasure in the text or note in the margin. Several of them boast a decent antiquity, but the oldest² carries its own date, A.C. 818. I confess my rudeness to you in closely tracing your steps so often. If in revenge for this rudeness you wish to examine these Mss. and see whether I have not lied for the good of my cause (for you well know, Sir, that no credit is due to polemics), you will find two of the Mss. in our public library, two in Bennet-college library, three in the Museum, and four in the Bodleian.

In Facundus, it is true, the editions six times repeat *in terra*; but these words are so inconsistent with the interpretation which Facundus is laboring to establish, that Bengelius fairly allows them to have been added by transcribers. We ought also to consider that Facundus has been published from a single Ms. The same corruption I suspect to have crept into the treatise De duplici Martyrio, and the true reading to be, "Commemorat et Joannes Evangelista triplex testimonium, spiritus, aquæ, et sanguinis." The same author afterwards says, "Quamquam hi tres unum sunt; unus enim Deus est, qui per spiritum, aquam, et sanguinem, declarat hominum generi virtutem et bonitatem suam." How easily might the seventh verse grow out of such observations as these!

I shall now briefly examine the pleas that have been set up in defence of the verse. 1. "The Arians erased it." We might expect some small evidence of this accusation. What cunning fellows those Arians were to erase this testimony, not only from their own books, but from the books and memories of the Catholics! You,

¹ See also his Hymn de Quatuor Temporibus, vol. i. p. 481.

² Mr. Astle has given a specimen in his Origin and Progress of Writing, Pl. xix. Spec. 2. p. 106.

Sir, I perceive, will neither positively condemn nor honorably acquit these heretics. You tell us that Socrates charges them with mutilating this very epistle. Does he expressly charge the Arians? Is his charge general or particular? He complains, that "they who wished to separate the divinity and the humanity of Christ" had erased this sentence, 1 John iv. 3. *Every spirit that divides Jesus, is not from God*; "which," says Socrates, "is in the old Mss." First, I cannot see how this doctrine could give any offence to the Arians. Secondly, if Socrates had accused them here, his silence on such a piece of fraud as the erasure of the three witnesses, is a strong presumption of their innocence. Thirdly, I should like to have seen a few of these ancient Mss. For at present every Greek Ms. every version, except the Vulgate, most of the Greek Fathers (all, according to Mr. Griesbach), and some though few of the Latins, agree in the common reading. Besides, there is a quaintness, as Bengelius rightly observes, which savors more of an interpolator's genius, than an apostle's simplicity. And a scholium in one of Mr. Matthæi's Mss. very naturally accounts for the corruption. "It is the character (of Antichrist) by false prophets and spirits to divide Jesus, in not confessing that he is come in the flesh." However, if you choose to defend Socrates, you will have the concurrence of that orthodox divine, Mr. Gibbon, vol. iv. p. 540, or viii. 272. For my own part, I think that his decision is very uncritical, and that the reading of the Vulgate in this place has not above twenty times as much authority as 1 John v. 7. But be that as it will, Socrates does not accuse the Arians; nor is his accusation founded, if he did accuse them; nor, if the accusation could be proved, would it help, but rather hurt your argument.

The holy Fathers were very unsuccessful in such accusations. I have already taken notice of Ambrose's charge against the Arians, that they erased *Spiritus est Deus* from John iii. 6. What harm had this sentence done the Arians? It proves, says Ambrose, the Deity of the Spirit. Could not the Arians suggest, with some color of probability, that the true construction was, *God is a Spirit*? Or, if they cut it out here, why did the blockheads leave it in the next chapter? They had however good success, for the sentence was scarcely to be found in any copies of that age, as Ambrose tells us, and, I dare say, with great truth. What dangerous impostors! Dr. Horsley says, that the orthodox would have poorly served their purpose by forging 1 John v. 7. I say, in like manner, that the orthodox would have poorly served their purpose by forging *Spiritus est Deus*, John iii. 6. Yet I think that both places have been corrupted by orthodox copiers. They crept into some Mss. by chance and negligence, but, as soon as they were known, were eagerly quoted and sent on every expedition against the heretics.

another example of this laudable zeal of the Fathers against heretics may be found in Ambrose. The heretics misapplied the words Mark xiii. 32. which seems to ascribe ignorance to the Son. Ambrose boldly denies the fact. "First," says he, "the ancient Greek Mss. have not the clause, that *neither the Son knoweth*; but no wonder, if they who have adulterated the holy scriptures, have also falsified this passage." A little after, however, conscious of the weakness of his assertion, he adds, "But grant it written by the Evangelists," and then proceeds to explain. An advocate for Ambrose will in vain suppose that he meant Matt. xxiv. 36. which will only reduce his hero from a falsehood to an equivocation. The heretics would care nothing about Matthew, if the reading in Mark were allowed to be genuine. I conclude therefore that the charges of the Fathers against the Arians show much more valor and spirit than prudence.

2. "This verse might be lost by the *homœoteleuton*. The eye might jump from one *μαρτυροῦντες* to the other, and consequently the remaining part of the two verses would be, *For there are three that bear record on earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood, and the three agree in one.*" To which supposition I answer,

First, that this argument ought to be sparingly used. If a marginal addition be taken into the text by transcribers, it is likely to have for its beginning or ending the same words that begin or end the adjacent sentence. Thus Augustine's explanation might be turned into a marginal note, "*Trinitas ipsa est, de qua recte dicitur, Tres sunt qui testimonium dant, Spiritus, id est, Pater; sanguis, id est, Filius; et aqua, id est, Spiritus sanctus; et tres unum sunt.*" Such a note would soon be pruned and polished into this form; *Sicut tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, &c.* which is actually the reading of several Mss. now extant. The critics generally reject the application of the prophecy in Matt. xxvii. 35. It would be ridiculous in this instance to argue from similar endings. The same rotten buttress is used by Grabe to prop the ruinous reading, John iii. 6. And the same might be used to support Cyprian's addition, 1 John ii. 17. How easy it would be to say, that the words which were in Cyprian's copy, and consequently in the Old Italic, and consequently in the Greek Mss. of the second century, and consequently in St. John's autograph, were swallowed up by that voracious monster, the *homœoteleuton*! "*Qui autem facit voluntatem Dei, manet in æternum, quomodo et Deus manet in æternum.*" If any man writes glosses and explanations in the margin of a book, he will find that many of them will begin like the following or end like the foregoing sentence. This canon however will do one good thing; it will make interpolation the easiest matter in the world. A forger has nothing to do but to take care that the passage which he inserts shall have this single requisite of a similar ending, and he will be provided with

a sufficient answer to all arguments drawn from the authority of Mss. and of versions, and from the silence of intermediate writers.

Secondly, this argument from the homœoteleuton is utterly excluded by the malice of fortune. For in the leap from one *μαρτυροῦντες* to another, the transcriber must have left untouched those puzzling words, *ἐν τῇ γῇ*. But those words are in no Greek Ms. in no version, in no Greek author that quotes the eighth verse; and almost all the Latin Mss. and Fathers that omit the heavenly witnesses, omit too all mention of the earth. I have referred, Letter II. p. 245. to Simón's seeming assertion that a Greek Ms. retained the words *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, but I have there given my reasons why he is mistaken. Newton had already hinted the same suspicion; and I have since seen a manuscript note of De Missy's in the margin of Wetstein's N. T. vol. ii. p. 721. where he adopts the same opinion, though he had formerly reasoned on the contrary supposition as an undoubted fact, Journ. Brit. xi. p. 78. I now dare boldly affirm that those words were no more in that Ms. than in any other. For Abbé Roger, in his dissertation on 1 John v. 7. p. 32. transcribes the eighth verse from this very Ms. and omits the words *ἐν τῇ γῇ*. Bede and Facundus I have already cleared from this spurious addition. Newton also supposes, what is not improbable, that the Latin Mss. which omit the seventh verse, and retain *in terra*, were interpolated from orthodox Mss. by conscientious critics, who might not be scrupulous about so trifling an insertion, though they were afraid to add a whole sentence. But since the defenders of the seventh verse may in this case urge, with some plausibility, the homœoteleuton, I am content, as I have said, Letter VI. p. 72. that all such Latin Mss. be neutral.

Bengelius wishes to transpose the seventh and eighth verses. I believe that this was more frequently the position of the verses, when the heavenly witnesses first obtained admittance. But as much as this hypothesis gains in one view, it loses in the other. The allegorical interpretation will then so naturally follow the verse which it explains, particularly in the copies that announce the heavenly witnesses with a *sicut*, that the manner in which the interpolation was made will be obvious to any person acquainted with the history of Mss. Twells saw something of this consequence; for he reasons against the idea of an allegory or marginal gloss on this ground, that the oldest and best Mss. prefix the seventh verse; but, says he, if the seventh verse were a gloss engendered by the eighth, the seventh would follow the eighth. The plain answer to this reasoning is, that such indeed was the arrangement of the two verses when the interpolation began, but that it was afterwards altered in compliment to the superior dignity and excellence of the seventh. I have declined the consideration of the *Disciplina Arcani*, nor shall I resume it. It is a dangerous hypothesis, which, if it were admitted, instead of strengthening

particular passages, would weaken the authority of the whole N. T. With equal reason Mill believes that the marginal notes produced by Simon from Greek Mss. (the most palpable glosses that can be conceived), are not intended for interpretations of the eighth verse, but are really the mangled limbs of the seventh. But while these learned men urge such frivolous arguments, they show more plainly than by a direct confession, how severely they feel the want of evidence. So severely, that Bengelius at last "begs leave to hope, that in due time, if not St. John's own autograph, yet some very ancient Greek Mss. containing the verse, may be found hidden in the shelves of Divine Providence." To which pious hope Wetstein answers in the words of Cicero: "*Hic tu tabulas desideras Heracliensium publicas, quas Italico bello, incenso tabulario, interisse scimus omnes. Est ridiculum ad ea quæ habemus, nihil dicere; quærere quæ habere non possumus.*"

3. "But the tenor of the context requires us to keep the verse." The opposers of the verse say, on the contrary, that its insertion confuses the whole sense, breaks the connexion, and makes the most intricate and ambiguous sentence that ever was seen. For my own part, I thought Newton's exposition of the shorter reading probable and consistent enough, till I was told by Dr. Horsley, Tracts, p. 346. that "it was a model of that sort of paraphrase by which any given sense may be fixed to any given words." I suspected, I confess, at first, that having before him both your exposition and Newton's, he might have confounded them in his mind, and given to Newton's the character which was due to yours. But this opinion I soon abandoned. I wish therefore that Dr. Horsley had favored us with his own paraphrase, and shown the truth of his assertion, "that the omission of the seventh verse breaks the connexion and heightens the obscurity of the apostle's discourse." Certainly the mention of the water, blood, and spirit, in the sixth verse, is with great propriety followed by the repetition of the same terms in the genuine text; which repetition is rendered emphatic by the exaltation of the spirit, water, and blood, into three witnesses. If the spirit that witnesses in the sixth verse be the Holy Spirit, which I think cannot be doubted, "because the Spirit is truth," why is the epithet, after being twice omitted, added in the seventh verse, to mark a distinction without a difference? If the word "holy," which is omitted in some few Mss. be spurious, why is the human spirit, without any mark or circumstance to distinguish it, repeated in the same breath? But if the Spirit in the eighth verse be the Holy Spirit, what is the sense of the same Spirit witnessing both in heaven and on earth? It will be to no purpose to invert the order of the words, and say, *There are three in heaven, and There are three on earth*, for still the Spirit is both in heaven and earth. You tell us that, without the seventh verse, the expression, *Witness of God*, in the ninth, has no due

antecedent. This, Sir, is a mistake. The witness of the Spirit in the sixth and eighth verses is a proper antecedent. The Spirit may be taken in two senses. The orthodox, who understand the Spirit personally, cannot deny that the witness of the Spirit is the witness of God; nor will either the orthodox or heretics deny, that the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, which attested the divine mission of Jesus, were truly the witness of God, which he witnessed of his Son. I have diligently perused all the orthodox expositions that have fallen in my way, but without ever having the good luck to understand them. I remember one very ingenious gentleman, who, in two letters to Dr. Bentley, offers to prove that the seventh verse is essential to the context, and only assumes two self-evident propositions: 1. That the Spirit signifies the mediatorial office; and, 2. That the water is the *Shechinah*. But I have dwelt longer than I intended on this subject. Where there is no external evidence, internal evidence can never be pleaded for the necessity of so large and so important an addition. I shall therefore hasten to dismiss the subject by a brief recapitulation of the inferences which may fairly be deduced from the facts dispersed through the foregoing Letters.

The only genuine words of 1 John v. 7, 8. are these: "Οὐκ ἦσαν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν. This is the reading of all the Greek Mss. above a hundred and ten; of near thirty of the oldest Latin, of the two Syriac versions, of the Coptic, Arabic, Æthiopic, and Slavonic. But Tertullian, in imitation of the phrase, *I and my Father are one*,¹ had said of the three persons of the Trinity, *Which three are one*. Cyprian was misled by this passage of his master. Taking it for an allusion to scripture, he wisely inferred that it was an application of 1 John v. 8. and, as he had no doubt of Tertullian's infallibility, he adopted the same application, and said boldly, "Of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, *And the three are one*."

That Cyprian in this place interprets the eighth verse, we are told by Facundus, who, by appealing to this very place of Cyprian to prove that the spirit, water, and blood, are meant of the Trinity, shows that he knew of no such text, and that in his opinion Cyprian knew of no such text, as the three heavenly witnesses. Fulgentius indeed quotes Cyprian's authority for the modern reading, but from the manner of his appeal it appears that he could not quote the verse on the faith of copies of his own age, and therefore relied on the faith, as he supposed, of Cyprian's copy.

¹ An antagonist of Beza's told him, that instead of endeavoring to wrest so stubborn a text as, *This is my body*, by vain explanations, he would do better to amend it at once, and read, *This is not my body*. The Jesuit Garasse (see Bayle, au mot *Beze*) soon after asserted, in print, that Beza had actually proposed this reading.

In the interval of more than two centuries, when this interpretation had been expressly maintained by Augustine and Eucherius, a marginal note of this sort crept into a few copies; *Sicut tres sunt qui testimonium dant in cælo, Pater, &c.* Such a copy was used by the author of the confession which Victor has preserved. Such another was used by the author of the books *De Trinitate*, if indeed he was a different person from the other. He would miss no fair opportunity of producing his favorite text, of which he perhaps was the fonder for having newly found it. The verse however seems to have had very small success till the eighth century, when the forger or forgers of the decretals, and of the spurious prologue to the canonical epistles, recommended it to public notice. Yet still it remained a rude, unformed mass, and was not completely licked into shape before the end of the tenth century. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries it was universally received for genuine, and therefore cited without suspicion in the Acts of the Lateran Council. These Acts were translated into Greek about the year 1300, and from them Emanuel Calecas borrowed his quotation. Joseph Bryennius, too, in the fifteenth century, quotes the same verse, but either from the Latin version, or from his friend Thomas Aquinas. In the thirteenth century, Haytho, king of Armenia, undertook to make a new edition of the Armenian scriptures, with the aid of Jerome's prologues and the Latin version. Haytho most probably inserted this verse in his edition on the authority of his supposed Jerome; but if Haytho, which is scarcely possible, neglected it, Uscan, who improved Haytho's edition from the Vulgate, could not fail of supplying the defect. With equal accuracy and fidelity this verse has been imposed on the modern Greeks in their printed *Apostolos*, on the Indian Christians by Menexes, on the Russians by their late editors, and on every other Christian nation in their several translations. It has been honestly inserted in several of the Syriac editions, and in the Greek and Russian confessions of faith.

The reader, who recollects the substance of my *Letters*, will easily distinguish the probabilities from the positive facts. But from the facts stated in this historical deduction, it is evident, that if the text of the heavenly witnesses had been known from the beginning of Christianity, the ancients would have eagerly seized it, inserted it in their creeds, quoted it repeatedly against the heretics, and selected it for the brightest ornament of every book that they wrote on the subject of the Trinity.

In short, if this verse be really genuine, notwithstanding its absence from all the visible Greek Mss. except two; one of which awkwardly translates the verse from the Latin, and the other transcribes it from a printed book; notwithstanding its absence from all the versions except the Vulgate, and even from many of the best and oldest Mss. of the Vulgate; notwithstanding the deep

and dead silence of all the Greek writers down to the thirteenth, and most of the Latins down to the middle of the eighth century ; if, in spite of all these objections, it be still genuine, no part of scripture whatsoever can be proved either spurious or genuine ; and Satan has been permitted, for many centuries, miraculously to banish the finest passage in the N. T. from the eyes and memories of almost all the Christian authors, translators, and transcribers.

At last, Sir, I see land. I have so clearly explained my sentiments concerning the authority of the disputed verse, and the merits of your book, in the progress of these Letters, that it will be needless to add any thing on either of those topics. As I was persuaded that Mr. Gibbon would never condescend to answer you, I have been bold enough to trouble you with my objections to your facts and arguments. The proofs of the spuriousness of 1 John v. 7. that I have enumerated, are, in my opinion, more than sufficient to convince any reasonable man. But whatever success I may have had in the main question, there is another point which I have proved to demonstration, that Mr. Travis is radically ignorant of the subject which he has undertaken to illustrate. You may therefore reply, Sir, or not, as shall seem good to you. If you think proper not to expose yourself again, which, to speak as a friend, I should think your wisest plan, I shall attribute your silence to a consciousness of your own weakness. You will call it contempt of your adversary, and I cannot deny the retaliation to be fair enough, considering with how small respect I have treated an author, who "has vindicated the authenticity of that important passage (1 John v. 7.) in a superior way, so as to leave no room for future doubt or cavil."¹ But if you reply, as you half promise,² I shall not think myself bound to continue the debate, unless both your matter and style much excel your Letters to Mr. Gibbon, and still more that Crambe recocta³ which you called a defence of Stephens and Beza. Such replies will carry their own refutation with them to all readers that are not eaten up with prejudice ; and others it would be folly to expect to satisfy. I shall therefore be perfectly silent, unless you can disprove the charges that I have brought against you, of ignorance and misrepresentation. In case of conviction, I dare not promise to retract

¹ "An Apology for the Liturgy and Clergy of the Church of England," p. 57, 58. How much stronger is this than the faint, half-faced compliment paid by the author of "Considerations on the Expediency of revising the Liturgy and Articles," p. 70. "Mr. Travis's labors on the genuineness of this text are highly meritorious !" And, as if this compliment were not cold enough, he soon damps it by adding, that many excellent critics will not admit Mr. Travis's vindication to be such as leaves no room for future doubt. From this and similar passages, our Consistent Protestant is, I fear, little better than a heretic.

² Gentleman's Magazine for March, 1790.

³ Ibid. Jan. 1790.

publicly (for I know how frail are the vows of authors and lovers), but I promise to try. If you confess the charges, and yet maintain that the errors you have committed are venial, and consistent with a knowledge of the subject, I shall excuse myself from the controversy, and consider you as degraded from that rank of literature which entitles one writer to challenge another.

ON THE SITUATION OF THE HADES OF HOMER.

WHEN Ulysses leaves the residence of Circe, he seeks, by the direction of the goddess,

“The dreary house of Aïdes, and of dread
Persephone.”

— ‘Αἶδας δόμον καὶ ἑταινῆς Περσεφονείης. *Odyss.* κ'. 491.

The characteristics of its situation are distinctly marked by the poet,

Ἴστων δὲ σήσας, ἀνὰ δ' ἰσρία λευκὰ περάσσας,
Ἦσθαι· τὴν δὲ κέ τοι πνοὴ Βορέας φέρῃσιν.
Ἄλλ' ὅπότ' ἂν δὴ νηὶ δι' ὠκεανοῖο περήσῃς,
Ἐνθ' ἀκτὴ τε λάχεια καὶ ἔλσaea Περσεφονείης,
Μακραί τ' αἰγέριροι, καὶ ἱτέαι ὠλεσίκαρποι·
Νῆα μὲν αὐτοῦ κέλσαι ἐπ' ὠκεανῷ βαθυδίνῃ,
Αὐτὸς δ' εἰς Ἀΐδew ἵεναι δόμον εὐρώεντα.

Ἐνθα μὲν εἰς Ἀχέροντα Πυριφλεγέθων τε ῥέουσι,
Κώκυρός θ', ὃς δὴ Στυγὸς ὕδατός ἐστιν ἀπορρώξ. κ. τ. λ.
Odyss. κ'. 505.

“ — once on board,

Your mast erected, and your shining sail
Unfurl'd, sit thou; the breathing north shall waft
This vessel on. But when ye shall have cross'd
The broad expanse of ocean, and shall reach
The oozy shore, where grow the poplar groves
And fruitless willows wan of Proserpine,
Push thither through the gulphy deep thy bark,
And, landing, haste to Pluto's murky abode.
There into Acheron runs not alone
Dread Pyriphlegethon, but Cocytus loud,
From Styx derived.”

From these lines we may learn that the road to Hades lay in a southern direction from the Ææan isle, and that Hades itself was situated *beyond the ocean*.

But what are we to understand by the 'Ωκεανός of Homer? Let us hear what his commentators have to say. In the first place, then, Cowper tells us, that by 'Ωκεανός "Homer could not possibly intend any other than a river;" and this river, he supposes, was the Nile. This he took from Clarke,¹ and Clarke took it from Diodorus Siculus. But all that Diodorus says, is, that some of the descriptions which Homer gives of the infernal regions are similar to the allegorical exhibitions of the Egyptians,² and that the most ancient name of the Nile amongst the Egyptians was 'Οκεάμην, which he græcizes into 'Ωκεανός;³ and on this foundation asserts, in other places, that the Egyptians themselves called it 'Ωκεανός.⁴ What gave rise to this absurdity was the expression of the poet ποταμός 'Ωκεανός.

Τὴν δὲ κατ' Ὀκεανὸν ποταμὸν φέρε κύμα ῥόοιο. Odyss. λ'. 638.

And,

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ποταμοῖο λίπεν ῥόον Ὀκεανοῖο. Odyss. μ'. 1.

"I know of no such river as the 'Ωκεανός," says Herodotus; "but I think that Homer, or some of the poets who preceded him, invented the name, and inserted it into their poetry."⁵ Eustathius speaks of it as a poetical license, which all poets are allowed to make use of.⁶ The mode in which Strabo endeavors to evade the difficulty may be seen in the note below.⁷ Ste-

¹ Clarke, note on Odyss. λ'. 638. and α'. 11.

² Diodorus Siculus, lib. i. in fine.

³ Τὴν δὲ ποταμὸν [the Nile] ἀρχαῖοτατον μὲν ὄνομα σχεῖν Ὀκεάμην, ὅς ἐστιν Ἑλληνιστὶ Ὀκεανός.

⁴ Ὀκεανὸν μὲν οὖν καλεῖν τὸν ποταμὸν, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν διδλέκτον, Ὀκεανὸν λέγειν τὸν Νεῖλον. And again, Οἱ γὰρ Αἰγύπτιοι νομίζουσιν Ὀκεανὸν εἶναι τὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς ποταμὸν Νεῖλον.

⁵ Οὐ γὰρ τίνα ἔγωγε οἶδα ποταμὸν Ὀκεανὸν εἶντα· Ὁμηρον δὲ, ἢ τίνα τῶν πρότερον γενομένων ποιητῶν, δοκέω τὸ ὄνομα εὐρόντα εἰς τὴν ποιήσιν ἐσνεύκασθαι. Herod. lib. ii. p. 109. Ed. H. Stephan. 1692.

⁶ Ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ὁ ποιητὴς ἐμφαίνει θάλασσαν εἶναι τὸν Ὀκεανὸν κατὰ τοὺς φιλοσόφους, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα ποταμὸν φανερώς αὐτὸν λέγει, ποιητικῶς φράξων, οὕτε τῆς ἀληθείας ἐθέλων ἀπέχεσθαι, καὶ τῇ ποιήσει δὲ τὰ εἰκότα χαρίζομενος. Eustathius in Odyss. λ'. 638.

⁷ Ποσειδῶνιος δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ σκοπέλους λέγειν τοτὲ μὲν καλυπτομένους, τοτὲ δὲ γυμνομένους, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμὸν φάναι τὸν Ὀκεανὸν, εἰκάζει τὸ βωῶδες αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐπὶ τὰς πλημμυρίδας ἐμφανίζεσθαι· τὸ μὲν οὖν πρῶτον εἶναι τὸ δὲ δεύτερον οὐκ ἔχει λόγον. Οὕτε γὰρ ποταμὸς βέωσιν εἰσὶν ἢ τῆς πλημμυρίδος ἐπίβασιν· πολλὸν δὲ μάλλον ἢ ἀναχώρησιν οὐ τοιαύτη. Ὅ, τε τοῦ Κράτητος λόγος διδάσκει τι πιθανώτερον. Βαθύρρουν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀνὸρρουν λέγει, (ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ποταμὸν) τὸν ὄλον Ὀκεανὸν, λέγει δὲ καὶ μέρος τοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ τι ποταμὸν, καὶ ποταμοῖο ῥόον, οὐ τοῦ ὄλου, ἀλλὰ τοῦ μέρους, ὅταν οὕτω φησὶν·

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ποταμοῖο λίπεν ῥόον Ὀκεανοῖο

Νηῦς, ἀπὸ δ' ἔκετο κύμα θαλάσσης ἐδρυπόροιο.

Οὐ γὰρ τὸν ὄλον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τῷ Ὀκεανῷ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ῥόον μέρος ἔντα τοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ, κ. τ. λ. Strabo, lib. i. c. 1. p. 6. Ed. Lips. 1819.

phanus Byzantius, however, has 'Ωκεανός, ὁ ποταμός ὁ περιέχων τὴν γῆν;¹ and Plato, speaking of the rivers of Tartarus, says that the largest and outermost is called Oceanus, and flows περικύκλῳ in a circle round about.² And this, too, is taken from Homer himself, who, speaking of the obstacles which lay in the way of those coming from the living to the shades, says:

Μέσσω γὰρ μεγάλοι ποταμοὶ καὶ δεινὰ ῥέεθρα,
'Ωκεανὸς μὲν πρῶτα. Odyss. λ'. 156.

There has been another interpretation given of 'Ωκεανός. Hesychius tells us that it signifies the *air*—'Ωκεανός, ἀήρ, θάλασσα,—and that 'Ωκεανοῖο πόρον signifies τὸν ἀέρα εἰς ὃν αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν τελευτώντων ἀποχωροῦσι; and accordingly the Scholiast on Hesiod interprets,

— παρ' 'Ωκεανὸν βαθυδίνην,

by ἐν τῷ ἀέρι.³ But I think few will follow him. The origin of this, by the way, we may learn from the same scholiast. Τάρταρά τ' ἡρόεντα· τὰ διήκοντα, says he, μέχρι τῶν ἐσχάτων τῆς γῆς, λέγει δὲ τὸν 'ΑΕΡΑ τὸν τὴν γῆν ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΝΤΑ. 'The ancients had some notion of an 'Ωκεανός, or general boundary of the earth, and that near to the land it was water; but their knowledge was so circumscribed, that they seem to have supposed both the *air*, and the *land*, and the *water*, to become finally blended together; and so Hesiod,

'Ενθα δὲ γῆς δνοφερῇ, καὶ Ταρτάρου ἡρόεντος,
Πόντου τ' ἀτρυγέτοιο, καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
'Εξείης πάντων πηγὰ καὶ πείρατ' ἔασιν,
'Αργαλέ', εὐρώεντα, τὰ τε στυγέουσι θεοὶ περ.

Theog. v. 807.

This seems to have been what they termed Χάος and Τάρταρος: and as the water was believed to blend into the air, it was very natural for them to take Τάρταρος for τὸν ἀέρα τὸν τὴν γῆν περιέχοντα. And hence they would confound it with the air in general, which was also a boundary; and hence, too, Jo. Diaconus ('Αλληγορίαι in Hes.) says 'Ωκεανός γὰρ ὁ 'ΟΡΙΖΩΝ λέγεται. ἔστι δὲ ὁρίζων ΚΥΚΛΟΣ ΔΙΑΙΡΩΝ ΤΟ ΑΝΩ ΗΜΙΣΦΑΙΡΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΚΑΤΩ.

But let us try if we cannot discover from Homer himself

¹ Stephanus Byzant. in 'Ωκεανός.

² Τυγχάνει δ' ἄρα ὕδατα ἐν τοῖτοις τοῖς πολλοῖς τέτταρ' ἅττα βέματα, ὧν τὸ μὲν μέγιστον καὶ ἐξωτάτω ῥέον περικύκλῳ, ὁ καλούμενος 'Ωκεανός ἐστι, κ. τ. λ. Platonis Phædo, p. 400. c. Ed. Lugd. 1590.

³ Vide Heinsium ad Hesiod. p. 63.

what he means by 'Ωκεανός. He tells us that it is situated at the end of the earth :

Εἰμι γὰρ ὀψομένη πολυφόρβον πείρατα γαίης,
'Ωκεανόν τε θεῶν γένεσιν. Il. ξ'. 200.

And,

'Αλλά σ' ἐς 'Ηλύσιον πεδίων καὶ πείρατα γαίης
'Αθάνατοι πέμψουσιν.

Οὐ νιφετὸς, οὐτ' ἄρ χειμῶν πολὺς, οὔτε πόντ' ὄμβρος,
'Αλλ' αἰεὶ Ζεφύροιο λιγυπνέοντας ἀήτας
'Ωκεανὸς ἀνίησιν. Odyss. δ'. 563.

And he says further—

— βαθυρρεῖται μέγα σθένος 'Ωκεανοῖο,
'Εξ οὔπερ πάντες ποταμοὶ, καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα,
Καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι, καὶ φρεῖατα μακρὰ νάουσιν. Il. φ'. 195.

From which it is evident that he understood by the ocean the general boundary, and that the word is used by Homer in no other sense than that in which it was used by other writers. He tells us, too, that the Ethiopians dwelt on the ocean :

Ζεὺς γὰρ ἐπ' 'Ωκεανὸν μετ' ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπίας
Χθιζὸς ἔβη μετὰ δαῖτα. Il. α'. 423.

And the Ethiopians were the last of men.

Αἰθίοπας, τοὶ διχθὰ δεδαίταται, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν. Odyss. α'. 22.

And here the Scholiast,¹ and Clarke after him, will have 'Ωκεανός to be ποταμός, a river. But Strabo's interpretation will at last prove right ; that it is τὸν ὠκεανὸν τὸν καθ' ὅλον τὸ μισημβρινὸν κλίμα τεταγμένον :² for all the parts of Africa that bordered on the ocean were inhabited by Ethiopians, who might therefore be justly termed the last of men, as dwelling at what was believed to be the *end of the world*.³ And so Eustathius, speaking of the figure of Africa, says, τὸν πρὸς τῇ Αἰθιοπία νοτίαν ὠκεανῖτιν πλευράν.⁴

This, then, is the ocean alluded to by Homer ; and the πείρατ' 'Ωκεανοῖο were none other than the Herculean Straits. And in like manner Dionysius speaks of Gades as situated,

— ἐπὶ τέρμασιν ὠκεανοῖο. v. 452.

And the term *Oceani ostium* is used by Cicero,⁵ and by

¹ 'Ο δὲ 'Ωκεανὸς ποταμός ἐστι, καθ' Ὁμηρον. Schol. in Il. α'. 423.

² Strabo, Geog. lib. i. p. 54.

³ Inde Oceanum esse dicitur, et hujus partem, quæ nemo hominum narrare potest. Sed quid ibi esse potest? Est enim desertum, et, sicut aiunt, est ibi *finis mundi*.—Anonymi Expositio totius Mundi et Gentium, ap. Geographiæ veteris scriptores Græci minores, vol. iii.

⁴ Eustath. in Dionys. Perieg. v. 176.

⁵ Cicero, Orat. pro L. Manilia. Opera, tom. ii. p. 343.

Mela,¹ to signify the *fretum Herculeum*. The voyage of Ulysses is, indeed, nothing more than a poetical history of the true adventures of the Phœnician navigators, who had been in the custom of passing the Straits before the time either of Homer or of his hero, and who had planted colonies and built towns on the western coast of Africa soon after the Trojan war.² And Strabo expresses the fullest conviction that the wanderings of Ulysses extended as far as the Atlantic.³

On the ocean, Homer tells us, dwelt the Cimmerians :

Ἦ δ' ἐς πείραθ' ἵκανε βαθυρρόου Ὕκεανοῖο·

Ἐνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμός τε, πόλις τε. *Odyss.* λ'. 13.

Here, then, we are told, is a decisive proof that Homer's *Νεκρομαντία* must be placed in Italy. And why? Because, forsooth, Ephorus places the Cimmerians in Italy, about Avernus, and says that they lived in subterraneous cells called Argillæ.⁴ But there were Cimmerians, we know, and who preserved their name, farther west than these, even on the ocean. The Britons were Cimmerians, as their name, which they have preserved to the present day, will testify.⁵ We find the name too in the Cimbri of Germany,⁶ who dwelt also on the ocean,⁷ and in the *Chersonesus Cimbrica*.⁸ And both Strabo and Plutarch confess that the Cimbri were the same people as the Cimmerians of the Bosphorus.⁹ Indeed, Diodorus Siculus includes all the Celtic tribes, and even the Britons, as one people, whom he allows to be the same as the Asiatic Cimmerians.¹⁰ And it is in these parts that Claudian places the scene of Homer's *Νεκρομαντία*—

¹ Mela, lib. iii. c. 15.

² Οἱ [Φοίνικες] καὶ τὰ ἔξω τῶν Ἡρακλείων στηλῶν ἐπῆλθον, καὶ πόλεις ἔκτισαν κῆκεῖ καὶ περὶ τὰ μέσα τῆς λιβύης παραλίας μικρὸν τῶν Τρωϊκῶν ὑστερον. Strabo, lib. i. c. 3. p. 76.

³ Ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα φανερώς ἐν τῇ Ἀτλαντικῇ πελάγει πλαττόμενα δηλοῦται. Strabo, lib. i. p. 40. And again: Οὐ δὲ θαυμάζοι τις ἂν ὅτε τοῦ ποιητοῦ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ὀδυσσεύς πλάνην μυθογραφήσαντος τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ὅστ' ἔξω στηλῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀτλαντικῇ πελάγει τὰ πολλὰ διαθέσθαι τῶν λεγομένων περὶ αὐτοῦ, κ. τ. λ. lib. iii. c. 4. p. 252.

⁴ Ap. Strab. lib. v.

⁵ Cymry.

⁶ Strabo, lib. iv. c. 3, 4. lib. vii. c. 1.—Plin. lib. iv. c. 14. et lib. xxxvi. c. 1.—Mela, lib. iii. c. 3. Justin, lib. xxxix. c. 3, 4.—Cæsar de Bell. Gal., &c.

⁷ Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. iv. c. 13.

⁸ Vide Mela, &c.

⁹ Ταῦτα δὲ δικαίως ἐπιτιμᾷ τοῖς συγγραφεῦσι Πισειδώνιος, καὶ οὐ κακῶς εἰκάζει, ὅτι ληστροικὸν ὄντες καὶ πλάνητες οἱ Κίμβριοι, καὶ μέχρι τῶν περὶ τὴν Μαιῶνιν ποτῆσαντα στρατεῖαν ἀπ' ἐκείνων δὲ καὶ ὁ Κιμμέριος κληθεῖς Βόσπορος, ὅλον Κιμβρικὸς, Κιμμερίους τοὺς Κίμβρους ὀνομασάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Strabo, lib. vii. c. 2. p. 69. Vide Plutarch. in Vit. Marii.

¹⁰ Diodorus Siculus, lib. v. c. 32. p. 355.

Est locus *extremum* qua pandit *Gallia litus*
Oceani prætentus aquis, ubi fertur Ulysses
 Sanguine libato populum movisse silentem.¹

Eustathius again resolves it all into a figment, and tells us that it is merely a poetical fable founded on the sound of the name—*Κιμμέριοι*, *quasi* *περὶ ἡρία vel* *περὶ ἔραν κείμενοι*.² But Tzetzes tells us plainly that the Cimmerians were a nation dwelling on the Western Ocean;³ and the Scholiast on Homer has an observation to the same effect.⁴

Homer characterises the Cimmerians, i. e. their country, and not their dwellings, as being clothed in darkness :

Ἐνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμος τε, πόλις τε,
 Ἡέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένοι· οὐδὲ ποτ' αὐτοὺς
 Ἡέλιος φάεθων ἐπιδέρεται ἀκτίνεσσιν,
 Οὐδ' ὅπότ' ἂν στείχῃσι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα,
 Οὐθ' ἔταν ἂψ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν προτράπηται.
 Odys. λ'. 14.

And in the twenty-fourth book he calls them *δῆμον Ὀνειρων*, a people of dreams :

Πὰρ δ' ἴσαν Ὀκεανοῦ τε βοὰς καὶ λευκάδα πέτρην,
 Ἡδὲ παρ' Ἡελίοιο πύλας, καὶ δῆμον Ὀνειρων,
 Ἦισαν.
 Odys. ω'. 11.

Δῆμον Ὀνειρων. Τὴν νύκτα, says the Scholiast, *ἐν ᾗ φαίνονται οἱ ὄνειροι*, i. e. the country was a region of darkness. Hades itself was “an obscure place filled with eternal gloom and shade.”⁵ And thus when Virgil places forests on the boundaries of Tartarus,

— Tenent media omnia sylvæ. *Æn.* vi. 131.

Servius says that we are to understand thereby darkness—“nam per *sylvas* tenebras et lustra significat.” And Virgil himself a little after (v. 138.) couples together woods and darkness:

— hunc tegit omnis
 Lucus, et obscuris claudunt convallibus umbræ.

¹ Claud. in Rufin. lib. i. v. 122.

² Οὕτω καὶ τοὺς Κιμμερίους ἔθνος ὄντας ἱστορίας γνωστὸν, μετακίττειν θέλει πρὸς παροιμίαν ἔδου διὰ ὁμοιότητα καὶ αὐτοὺς ὀνόματα ἐπιλεξάμενος· δοκεῖ γὰρ παραδηλοῦν κατὰ τὸν ἦχον τῆς προσφορᾶς ἡ λέξις, τοὺς περὶ ἡρία κείμενους ἢ περὶ ἔραν, ὥς εἰς νεότερους. Eustath. in Odys. λ'. 13.

³ Κιμμέριοι, ἔθνος περὶ τὸν Ὀκεανὸν ζῶν κεκαλυμμένον. Tzetzes in Lycophron. Alexand. v. 1427. And, Οἱ Κιμμέριοι δὲ, κατὰ μὲν Ὅμηρον, περὶ τὸν δυτικὸν Ὀκεανὸν κεῖνται. Tzetzes in Lycophron. v. 695.

⁴ Ἄλλοι δὲ Κιμμερίους φασὶν ὑποτίθεσθαι τοὺς κατὰ τὴν δόξιν οἰκουντας καὶ προσκειμένους, τοὺς κατὰ τὸν ἔδον τόποις. Didymi Schol. in Odys. λ'. 14.

⁵ Ἄδης, χωρίον ἀφύγας, σκότους αἰώνιον καὶ ζόφον πεπληρωμένον. Etymologi-con Magnum, in verbo.

Again, when Virgil mentions

— *loca nocte silentia late*, v. 265.

Servius observes, “Aut hoc est quod supra ait, Umbræque silentes, aut vult ostendere esse *partem mundi*, in qua *perpetuæ sunt tenebræ*.” Accordingly we generally find the western parts of Europe, with the seas and islands adjacent, coupled in the writings of the ancients with the idea of darkness and of gloom. They were the regions of the setting sun. Thus Hesiod, speaking of the Gorgons,

Γοργούς θ', αἱ ναίουσι πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο,
Ἐσχατῇ πρὸς ΝΥΚΤΟΣ. Hesiod. Theogn. v. 274.

And the cattle of Geryon, in Erythia, were kept

Σταθμῷ ἐν ἙΠΟΕΝΤΙ, πέρην κλυτοῦ Ὠκεανοῖο.

Theog. v. 293.

The ocean, according to Suidas, was not navigable, partly on this account—*διεκπλεῦσαι οὐκ ἐν βραχέδι καὶ ΣΚΟΤΟΕΙΔΗ τυγχάνοντα*.¹ And in later times, the Nubian geographer, Al Edrisi, uniformly speaks of the Atlantic as (according to the Latin version) *mare tenebrosum*, or *mare tenebrarum*.² The island Thule, which was a name successively applied to most of the isles of the Celtic coast, was particularly represented as a gloomy place. Bochart would even derive its name from this circumstance—*quasi גִּזְרַת טוּלִי gezirat Thule*, i. e. *insula tenebrarum*. Thus Statius:

Vel super Hesperiae vada *caligantia* Thules.—Sylv. lib. iii. 5. 20.

And again,

— *Nigræ littora* Thules.—Lib. iv. 4. 62.

And,

— *Quantusque nigrantem*

Fluctibus occiduis fessoque Hyperione Thulen.—Lib. v. 2. 55.

We may learn, however, from the geographers, what it was to which the poets alluded—it was the length of the night during winter in the northern climates.³ And it is not a little remarkable that according to Eustathius the kind of darkness which made the Cimmerians proverbial, was precisely the same

¹ Suidas in Ὠκεανός.

² “Ea occidentis ulterioris parte, in qua e mari *Tenebroso* egreditur sinus maris Damasceni tendens in Orientem.” And just after, “inter mare Damascenum ac mare *Tenebrosum*.” And again, “Aggressi sunt mare *Tenebrarum*, quid in eo esset exploraturi.” *Geographia Nubiensis ex Arab.* in Lat. a Gabrieli Sicnita, &c. Par. 1610.

³ “Noctes per hyemem obscuræ.” *Mela*, lib. iii. c. 6.—“Nulli per brumam dies.” *Plin.* lib. ii. c. 75.—And so Strabo, Ἥλιος οὐκ ἔχει κατὰ πόλιν. Lib. iv.

as that for which Thule was famous :—ὡς ἐντεῦθεν τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν τῷ ἐκεῖ κλίματι μερίζεσθαι εἰς ἡμερονύκτιον ἓν, ἥγουν εἰς μίαν ἡμέραν, καὶ εἰς μίαν νύκτα· καθὰ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος περὶ τῶν Κιμμερίων λέγων, φησὶ μὴ ἐνδέχεσθαι, ἀνθρώπους εἶναι οἱ τὴν ἐξάμηνον νύκτα καθεύδουσιν.¹

Another characteristic of the place given by Homer is the λευκάδα πέτρην, which was situated, according to the Scholiast, πρὸς τοῖς καταχθονίοις μέρεσιν, and which Eustathius has, *de more*, turned all into a fable. May it not have some reference to the *white cliffs* which it is pretended gave first to Britain the name of *Albion*? The whiteness of the cliffs would most probably be one of the first and principal sea-marks of the Phœnicians to recognise the coast by; and it is evidently to the British isles that the ancients refer under the name of Tartarus, as the more southerly islands of the Hesperides were their Elysium.

Hades and Tartarus, and the adjacent parts, were sacred to Pluto, and more particularly to Proserpine. Thus Homer :

Ἦ τί μοι εἶδωλον τόδ' ἀγανὴ Περσεφόνεια
"Ωτρυν". Odyss. λ'. 212.

And,

— ὥτρυνεν γὰρ ἀγανὴ Περσεφόνεια. Ibidem, v. 225.

And,

Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ψυχὰς μὲν ἀπεσκέδασ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλη
Ἄγνῃ Περσεφόνεια. v. 384.

And,

— ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρόν δέος ἥρει,
Μή μοι Γοργεῖην κεφαλὴν δεινοῖο πελώρου
Ἐξ Ἄϊδος πέμψειεν ἀγανὴ Περσεφόνεια. v. 632.

Accordingly we learn from the Scholiast on Plato edited by Rubnkenius, that there were seven islands in the ocean which lies without the Straits, sacred to Proserpine.² And Strabo, speaking of the wonders related of these parts, says : *περὶ δὲ τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ τῆς Κόρης, πιστότερα· ὅτι φησὶν εἶναι νῆσον πρὸς τῇ Βρεττανικῇ, καθ' ἣν ὁμοῖα τοῖς ἐν Σαμοθράκῃ περὶ τὴν Δήμητραν καὶ τὴν Κόρην ἱεροποιεῖται.*³

Saturn, too, was said to be banished to and confined in Tartarus—

¹ Eustathius in Dionys. Perieg. v. 581.

² Ὅτι μὲν ἐγένετο τοιαύτη τις νῆσος καὶ τηλικαύτη, θελοῦσι τινὲς τῶν ἱστοροῦντων τὰ περὶ τῆς ἔξω θαλάσσης· εἶναι γὰρ καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν χρόνοις ἐπὶ μὲν νῆσους ἐν ἡκεῖνῃ τῇ πελάγει Περσεφόνης ἱεράς. Schol. in Plut. Ed. Rubnk. in Timæum, p. 207.

³ Strabo, lib. iv. c. 4. p. 320.

— οὐδ' εἰ κε τὰ νείατα πείραθ' ἱκηαι

Γαίης καὶ πόντοιο, ἔν' Ἰαπετός τε Κρόνος τε

ἤμενοι, οὐτ' αὐγῆς ὑπερίονος ἡελίου

τέρποντ', οὐτ' ἀνέμοισι· βαθὺς δέ τε Τάρταρος ἀμφίς. *Il. θ'. 478.*

Plutarch, speaking of the demons and perturbations and prodigies in the air, and other wonders which were fabled to be heard and seen in the islands of Britain, says, that “in one of those islands *Saturn* was reported to be imprisoned, with many demons attendant on him.”¹ And in another place he tells us the same story of several islands to the west of Britain; “in one of which,” says he, “the barbarians feign that *Saturn* is detained by Jupiter, who, as his son, having the care of these islands and the sea adjacent, which is named *Κρόνιον Πέλαγος*, resides a little below.”² Indeed the name of *Κρόνος* or *Saturn* is intimately connected with these parts in all the accounts that the Greeks give of them. The ocean itself, above the Straits, was termed *Κρόνιος Ὠκεανός*:³

Ἦτοι ὁ μὲν Λοκροῖο παρ' ἐσχατιῇν ζεφύριοιο

Ἀτλας ἐσπέριος κυκλήσκειται· αὐτὰρ ὑπερθεῖν

Πρὸς βορέην, ἵνα παῖδες ἀρειμανέων Ἀριμασπῶν,

Πόντον μιν καλέουσι πεπηγότα τε Κρόνιον τε.

Dionys. Perieg. v. 29.

Ὁ δὲ πρὸς βορρᾶν, πεπηγὼς λέγεται πόντος, καὶ Κρόνιος, observes Eustathius; and, after rehearsing the various reasons assigned for the name, he adds—ὁ δὲ μῦθος καὶ τὰ τῶν Κρόνου ἐκτεμῶν αἰδοῖα ἐκεῖ ῥίπτει.⁴ Porphyry tells us that *Saturn* constructed a cave in the ocean, where he concealed his children.⁵ Strabo, speak-

¹ Ὁ δὲ Δημήτριος ἔφη τῶν περὶ τὴν Βρεττανίαν νήσων εἶναι πολλὰς ἐρήμους σποράδας, ὧν ἑνίας δαίμωνων καὶ ἡρώων ὑπομάζεσθαι, πλεῖσαι δὲ αὐτὰς ἱστορίας καὶ θέας ἔρεκα τομπῇ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τὴν ἔγγιστα κειμένην τῶν ἐρήμων, ἔχουσιν οὐ πολλοὺς ἐποικούντας, ἱεροὺς δὲ καὶ ἀσύλους πάντας ὑπὸ τῶν Βρεττανίων ὄντας. ἀφικομένην δ' αὐτοῦ νεωστὶ σύγχυσιν μεγάλην περὶ τὸν ἀέρα καὶ διωσημαίαν πολλὰς γενέσθαι, κ. τ. λ. ἐκεῖ μὲν τοι μίαν εἶναι νήσον ἐν ᾗ τὸν Κρόνον κατεῖρχθαι φρουρούμενον ὑπὸ Βριάρεω καθεύδοντα. δεσμὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸν ὕπνον μεμηχανήσθαι. πολλοὺς δὲ περὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι δαίμονας ὁπαδοὺς καὶ θεράποντας. Plutarchus περὶ τῶν Ἑκκελοιοπότων Χρηστηρίων, p. 189. ed. Basil. 1574.

² Ὡγγυλῇ τις νήσος ἀπόπροθεν εἰν ἄλλ' κεῖται
ἐρμόν ἡμεῶν πέντε Βρεττανίας ἀπέχουσα πλείοντι πρὸς ἐσπέρων, ἑτεραὶ δὲ τρεῖς ἴσων ἐκείνης ἀφεστᾶσαι, καὶ ἀλλήλων, προκεινται μάλιστα κατὰ διωσμὰς ἡλίου θερμὰς, ὧν ἐν μιᾷ τὸν Κρόνον οἱ βάρβαροι καθεῖρχθαι μυθολογοῦσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς, τὸν δὲ ἄς υἱὸν ἔχοντα φρουρὸν τῶν τε νήσων ἐκείνων καὶ τῆς θαλάττης, ἣν Κρόνιον Πέλαγος ὀνομάζουσι παρακάτω κείσθαι. Plutarch. περὶ τοῦ Ἐμφαινομένου Προσώπου τῷ Κύκλῳ τῆς Σελήνης, p. 614. vide locum.

³ Ἦγον παρὰκεινται τοῖς Ἑρκυνίας δρυμοῖς πρὸς τῷ αὐτῷ ΚΡΟΝΙΩ ὈΚΕΑΝΩ. Eustath. in Dionys. v. 285.

⁴ Eustath. in Dionys. v. 32.

⁵ Οὗτω καὶ ὁ Κρόνος ἐν τῷ ὠκεανῷ αὐτῷ ἄντρον κατασκευάζει, κἀκρύπτει τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ παῖδας. Porphyri. de Antro Nympharum, p. 254.

ing of an island without the Straits, says, *Κεῖται δ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἐσπερίων τῆς νήσου μερῶν ἡ πόλις· προσεχὲς δ' αὐτῇ τελευταῖόν ἐστι τὸ Κρόνιον πρὸς τῇ νησιδί, κ. τ. λ.*¹ And Eustathius informs us that the Pillars of Hercules were once called the *Pillars of Saturn*, *ἐκαλοῦντό ποτε καὶ Κρόνου στῆλαι.*²

Tartarus was the residence of the rebellious Titans :

Hic genus antiquum Terræ, Titania pubes,
Fulmine dejecti, fundo volvuntur in imo. *Æn.* vi. 580.

And so Callimachus places the abode of the Titans amongst the Celtic tribes, in the utmost boundaries of the west :

Καὶ νῦν πότε ξυνός τις ἐλεύσεται ἄμμιν ἄεθλος
"Υστατον, ὀππότε" ἂν οἱ μὲν ἐφ' Ἑλλήνεσσι μάχαιραν
Βαρβαρικὴν καὶ Κελτῶν ἀναστήσαντες Ἀρηά
"Οψιγόνοι Τιτῆνες ἀφ' ἐσπέρου ἐσχατόωντος
Ῥώσσονται, νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότες ἢ ἰσάριθμοι
Τεῖρεσιν, ἡνίκα πλεῖστα κατ' ἥερα βουκολέονται.
Hymn. eis Δῆλον, v. 171.

And Justin,³ and the Scholiast on Homer,⁴ place the scene of their rebellion and discomfiture in the neighborhood of Tartessus. And Hesiod says that the Titans

Δῶματα ναιετάουσιν ἐπ' Ὀκεανοῖο θεμέθοις. *Theogon.* v. 816.

The Saturnian Ocean was also termed the Dead Sea:

Ἄλλὰ δ' αὖ καὶ νεκρὸν ἐφήμισαν. *Dionys.* v. 33.

— Κρόνιον δὲ ἐκικλήσκουσιν

Πόντον Ὑπερβόρειοι μέρες, νεκρὴν τε θάλασσαν.

Orph. Argonaut. v. 1085.

By this we are to understand a *region of the dead*: for it is there, i. e. in Hades, and in Tartarus, that Homer describes the dwelling of the Shades. And so Claudian, speaking of the extreme western regions, says :

Est locus, extremum qua pandit Gallia litus
Oceani prætentus aquis, ubi fertur Ulysses
Sanguine libato populum movisse silentem.
Illic *umbrarum* tenui stridore volantum
Flebilis auditur quæstus. *Simulacra* coloni
Pallida, defunctasque vident migrare *figuras*, &c.

Claudian. in Rufinum, lib. i. v. 122.

Tzetzes tells us of a people who inhabited the coasts of the ocean about Britain, and who were accustomed to hear when

¹ Strabo, lib. iii. c. 5. p. 272.

² Eustath. in *Dionys.* v. 64.

³ "Saltus vero Tartesiorum, in quibus Titanas bellum adversus deos gessisse proditur, incoluere Curetes." Justin. *Hist. lib. xlv. c. 4.*

⁴ Schol. in *Hom. Il. 9. v. 479.*

in their beds knocking at their doors, and voices calling on them: on this they arose, and, coming to the beach, found strange ships filled with seamen. Having gone on board, they arrived, after one moment's rowing, at the island of Britain, although in their own ships they could scarcely reach it in a day and a night with full sail. Here they disembarked, but saw no one; hearing however voices calling to them, and holding conversation with invisible beings. And after some time they returned home by the same conveyance, and in the same space of time. "Hither," he says, "pass over, according to the Grecians, the *souls of the dead*, which is similar to what Hesiod says of the heroes."¹ According to Porphyry, indeed, the western parts of the world generally were consecrated to the demons, as the eastern parts were to the gods.

A principal reason for supposing Homer's Hades to be in Italy, appears to have been, because Avernus was reported to be one of the entrances to the infernal domains. But if the real origin of this fable had been attended to, no such conclusion would ever have been drawn from it. The entrances to Hades will be generally found to be situated on the coast, and in such situations as to afford a presumption of their having formerly been stations, or watering-places, of the Phœnicians, in their voyages towards the Straits and the regions of the West.

One of the most famous was the Promontory of Tænarus in Laconia; and its situation, and the temple of Neptune for which it was noted, are sufficient to confirm the observation. And the author of the Orphic Argonautics mentions it particularly as the point of Greece which they made for in their return from the same voyage:

Καί ρ' αὖ μὲν πλώοντες εὐκτιμένην ἐπ' Ἰωλκὸν
Θῦνον· ἐγὼ δ' ἰκόμεν ἐπὶ Ταίναρον ἡνεμόεντα, κ. τ. λ.

Orph. Argonaut. v. 1376.

Such, too, was the case with Avernus. It was probably from

¹ Περὶ τὴν ἀκτὴν τοῦ περὶ τὴν Βρετανίαν νῆσον Ὡκεανοῦ, ἄνθρωποι τινες οἰκοῦσιν ἰχθυόθρῃαι, κάτοικοι μὲν Φραγγοί, φέρον δὲ μὴ τελευτᾶν αὐτοῖς. Οὗτοι περὶ τὰς αὐτῶν οἰκίας καθεύδοντες φωνῆς ἀκούουσι καλοῦσης αὐτοὺς, καὶ κρήτου περὶ τὰς θύρας αἰσθάνονται. ἀναστάντες δὲ πλοῖα εὐρίσκουσιν τινα, οὐχὶ τὰ αὐτῶν, ἐπιβάτων μεστέ. οὗ ταῦτα οὖν εἰσελθόντες μίᾳ βοτῇ πρὸς τὴν Βρετανίαν νῆσον καταυροῦσι κοπηλατωόμενοι. καί τερ μολλὺς δὲ νυκθήμερῃ λαῖφῃσι πεπταμένοις καταπλέοντες εἰς αὐτὴν, ὅτε ταῖς ἰδίαις ναῦσι κέχρηται. ἐκεῖ γοῦν ἀποβάντες ἐξάγουσιν οὐδ' οὐκ εἰδότες φέροντων ἐπιβάτας. οὐδὲνα δὲ δρῶντες ἀκούουσι φωνῆς τῶν υποδεχομένων αὐτοὺς κατ' ὄνομα, καὶ κατὰ φυλακὴν, καὶ κατὰ συγγενείαν καὶ τέχην καλοῦσης αὐτοὺς· καὶ αὐτῶν δὲ ὁμοίως ἀποκρινομένων. καὶ οὕτω πάλιν μίᾳ βοτῇ πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν ἀποπλέοντες εἰσθάνονται τῶν νηῶν ἐλαφροτέρων, ἢ ὅτε οὐδ' εἶχον ἀπεκκμῆζον· ἐν μόνῳ πάντες ἔφασαν Ἑλλήνων, ἐκεῖ τὰς τῶν ἀποβατικόντων διέγειν ψυχὰς. δὲ γοῦν καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ φησὶ περὶ τῶν ἡρώων. Tzetzes in Hesiodi Erg. p. 60. Ex Off. Plantin. Raphelengii. 1608.

thence, or at least from thereabouts, that they made immediately for the ocean; just as we learn from Diodorus Siculus,¹ that the island Melita (now Malta) was to those perhaps who sailed along the African coast instead of the coast of Europe. There was reported, too, to be a descent to the shades on the coast of the Mariandyni, in Pontus:

Ἰὴν Μαριανδυνῶν ἐπικέλσεται νοστήσαντες.

"Ενθα μὲν εἰς Αἴδαο καταβάτης ἐστὶ κέλευθος.

"Ακρη τε προβλῆς Ἀχερουσιᾶς ὑπόθι τείνει,

Δινήεις τ' Ἀχέρων αὐτὴν διὰ νελοθι τέμνων

"Ακρην, ἐκ μεγάλης προχοᾶς ἴησι φάραγγος.

Apollon. Rhod. Argon. lib. ii. v. 352. vide Schol.

This was situated on the Euxine; but this sea was believed by the ancients to be connected towards the north, with the ocean. And it is worthy of remark, that there was here a cave similar to that at Tænarus.² There was a *Νεκρομαντία* in Thesprotis, which was also called Avernus. And there was, moreover, an Avernus, or *Λορνος*, near Tartessus.³

Virgil has, doubtlessly, placed his *Νεκρομαντία* in Italy. But even in Virgil's description of the infernal regions, there are many marks which identify its real situation with that of the Hades of Homer. Deiphobus, for instance, asks of Æneas—

Sed te qui vivum casus, age fare vicissim,

Attulerint : *pelagine venis erroribus actus*?

An monitu Divum? An quæ tu fortuna fatigat,

Ut tristes sine sole domos, loca turbida, adires.

Æn. vi. 531.

"Non ad inferos," says Servius, "sed ad locum in quo inferorum descensus est, i. e. ad Avernum, si intra terram sunt inferi." But if this were the meaning, the question would be quite absurd; as being shipwrecked on the coast of Italy, could imply no necessity of going to Hades. This was seen by Servius, who therefore adds—"Alii aliud intelligunt, qui sub terra esse inferos volunt secundum chorographos et geometras, qui dicunt terram σφαιροειδῆ esse, quæ aqua et aëre sustentatur; quod, si est, ad antipodes potest navigatione perveniri, quia,

¹ Ὅς θεοῖς μὲν τὰ ἀνατολικὰ δαίμοσι δὲ τὰ δυτικὰ. Porphyry. de Antro Nympharum, p. 268.

² Lib. v.

³ "In eo primùm Mariandyni urbem habitant, ab Argivo (ut ferunt) Hercule datum. Heraclea vocitatur: id famæ fidem adjicit. Juxta specus est Acherusia, ad Manes (ut aiunt) pervius; atque inde extractum Cerberum existimant." Mela, lib. i. c. 20. "In ipso Tænaro Neptuni templum, et specus, illi, quem in Ponto Acherusium diximus, facie et fabula similis." Mela, lib. ii. c. 4.

⁴ Ἡ δὲ Τάρτησος πέλις Ἰβερικῇ περὶ τὸν Ἀρρὸν λίμνῃ. Schol. Aristoph. in Ran.

92 *Philological Extracts from E. H. Barker* 3

quantum ad nos spectat, inferi sunt, sicut nos illis. Hinc est quare sub terra inferos dicimus esse, quamque illud sit, quia novem cingitur circulis. Tiberianus inducit epistolam vento allatam ab antipodibus, quod habet, 'Superi inferis salutem,' &c. He need not, however, have removed them quite so far, as the passage evidently refers to the situation of the Homeric Hades, and the notion is stolen from the question put to Ulysses in the *Odyssey* :

Τέκνον ἐμὸν, πῶς ἦλθες ὑπὸ Ζόφον ἡρόεντα,
 Ζῶος ἐών; χαλεπὸν δὲ τάδε ζῳοῖσιν ὀρᾶσθαι.
 Μέσσω γὰρ μεγάλοι ποταμοὶ καὶ δεινὰ ῥέεθρα,
 Ὀκεανὸς μὲν πρῶτα, τὸν οὕτως ἐστὶ περιῆσαι,
 Πεζὸν ἐόντ', ἣν μὴ τις ἔχῃ εὐεργέα νῆα. Od. λ'. 154.

Where Eustathius observes, ὅτι φανερώς ἐνταῦθα ὁ Ποιητὴς δηλοῖ τὴν Ὀδυσσέως μυθικὴν εἰς αἶδου κατέλευσιν ἐπὶ τὰ πέραν ἐκείθεν τέρματα γενέσθαι τοῦ Ὀκεανοῦ, ἐνθα καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας δηλαδὴ φασὶν δύνειν.

T. W.

PHILOLOGICAL EXTRACTS

*From E. H. BARKER'S Letters on the Authorship
 of Junius' Letters.*

No. II.—[Concluded from No. LXXV.]

5. THE only other instance of the kind, which I have seen in the writings of Sir Philip, is that about the Elgin marbles and the statues of Phidias, in the Letter Missive to Lord Holland, 1816. pp. 61-73. and it is an admirable specimen of his talents for philosophical criticism:—

“In reading the Report of the select Committee, (of the House of Commons on the Elgin marbles,) one of their first propositions, including an historical assertion, seems to me a paradox, the truth of which however I am not bound or disposed to deny, viz. ‘that the date of these works must be referred to the original building of the *Parthenon*, and to the designs of *Phidias*, the dawn of every thing which adorned and ennobled Greece.’ From this position, compared with what we know of the architecture and statuary of Athens, it follows that the *first* productions of those arts were at once perfect, without previous defect or gradual improvement. The dawning light is in the meridian. Birth and maturity have but one date. This discovery is new in the natural history of man. In all other attainments of human skill, the arrival at perfection is by progression. Were there no temples or statues in Athens or in Greece, before *Phidias*? By whom, and when was the temple of Jupiter built at Olympia; or the temple of Theseus

at Athens?¹ On questions of date it is in vain to look for accuracy in the Greek historians, nor is it always safe to rely on their veracity. On this point I speak with more moderation than I think. A peremptory language in matters of opinion, is always offensive and never in its place, but when it is called on to command. In *me*, who court instruction, because I want it, a tone of authority would be worse than unbecoming. *Gracia mendax* was proverbial among the Romans. Plutarch and others speak of the *Hecatompodon* and the *Parthenon*, as of one and the same building. Now it appears to me that either this must be a mistake, or the text is not correct, or it is a mere epithet carelessly used. The *Hecatompodon* was a square temple of a hundred feet, and if it were fifty feet high, would make half a cube. Mr. Wilkins says that the area embraced by the *uppermost* step of the *Parthenon*, is little more than two hundred and twenty-seven feet in length and one hundred and one in breadth. The former then must have been a moderate building compared to the latter. But Herodotus affirms that Xerxes burnt the citadel, and with it the temple of the Goddess, of which last he repented; and that the utter destruction of the whole city was completed by Mardonius. Yet Mr. Stuart says: 'The temple of Minerva in the Acropolis was called the *Parthenon* and *Hecatompodon*.' To me it is plain, that they were different temples, on the same site, with very different dimensions. The former was built about fifty years after the *Hecatompodon* was destroyed. Be all this as it may, I shall leave it to the learned to discover the meaning of Plutarch's words, and proceed to other questions in *my* mind of much greater interest and curiosity, concerning the two celebrated statues of Minerva and Jupiter, undoubtedly the works of Phidias, and placed by him in their respective temples at Athens and Olympia.² Here again we have a singular proof of the inaccuracy and carelessness of Grecian historians. Pausanias and all of them say that these two statues, one of which was fifty-four feet high, sitting, the other thirty-nine feet, standing, were positively made of ivory and gold. Of the latter Pausanias says: *Αὐτὸ δὲ ἐκ τε ἐλέφαντος τὸ ἄγαλμα καὶ χρυσοῦ πεποίηται*, (p. 41.) Some of these careless writers, quoted by Meursius, describe the Minerva as made all of *pure* gold; others, as all of ivory, without a qualification, abatement, or explanation of any kind. Even Pliny, on this point, is full as inaccurate and obscure, as if he had never seen the two statues, or never considered or inquired what they were made of. He says, (lib. 34. cap. 8.) 'Phidias, præter Jovem Olympium, quem nemo æmulatur, fecit et ex ebore æque Minervam Athenis, quæ est in Parthenone adstans;' which words, as long as words express meaning, affirm that both the statues were made of ivory. Now *my* conviction is, that every one of these writers, in the

¹ "After a long search, I cannot discover with certainty, by whom, or when the temple of Theseus was built. On the whole, however, it seems probable that it was erected by Cimon, or in his time, or about forty years before Pericles. I leave it to the learned to consider, whether that date of such a temple, with such a statuary, can be consistent with the assertion of the Committee."

² "Pausanias says that the temple of Jupiter at Olympia was built, but not when, by a native architect called Libo; that it was sixty-eight feet high, ninety-five feet wide, and two hundred and thirty feet long. He says that the god, sitting on a throne, was made of gold and ivory. (l. 5. p. 304-5-6.) The temple must have been built long before the Peloponnesian war!"

94 *Philological Extracts from E. H. Barker*

literal and indisputable sense of their own language, asserts a gross, ridiculous falsehood. Such enormous statues neither were, nor could be made of gold or ivory, in their solidity, as they might have been of marble. A quantity of gold or ivory, or both, sufficient for the purpose, could not have been found in all Greece, much less in Attica; and, even if it had existed, Phidias and Pericles, and indeed the people of Athens and Elis must have been frantic to lavish and waste such precious materials on the inside of such statues. The fact is, they were hollow, and covered in *some* parts with *laminae*, or thin plates applied of ivory, in *others* of gold, which on occasion might be and actually were taken off. All the gold, furnished by Pericles to Phidias for the statue of Minerva, amounted only to forty-four talents of pure gold, equal to about 8,525*l.* in our standard. The intrinsic value of the Attic talent is by no means ascertained by comparison with any modern coin, much less is it a clear case among the learned. This quantity might be sufficient to cover as much of the statue as was not plated with ivory, but would go a very little way to fill it. The outside, so formed, was supported by an internal construction or machinery of brass and cedar-wood. As far as I have been able to trace this question, the first person who discovered the fallacy imposed on us by the Greek writers, and swallowed without hesitation or inquiry by the moderns, was M. de Pauw, a merciless inquisitor into literary frauds, and a fatal foe to learned impostors. The following extract from his *Recherches Philosophiques sur les Grecs* (Vol. ii. p. 112.) printed at Berlin in 1788, ought to excite the reader's curiosity. After proving to demonstration that the ivory and gold in question consisted of plates laid on, or *appliqués, par pièces rapportées*, &c. he says:—

“ ‘Pour communiquer à toutes ces pièces rapportées le degré de consistance dont elles avoient besoin, il faut que la *Minerve* de Phidias ait été intérieurement soutenue par un corps prodigieux de fer ou d'airain, revêtu dans sa principale longueur de lames de bois de cèdre, qui formoient l'ame de ce colosse, dont toute la capacité étoit vuide; et *Lucien* avoue que ces ouvrages d'ostentation, si riches en apparence, et où l'on ne voyoit briller que l'or et l'ivoire, étoient intérieurement garnis de toiles d'araignées, et servoient l'asyle aux insectes et aux animaux immondes, qui fréquentoient les temples et les autels de la Grèce.’ ”

“ Lucian's words, to which M. Pauw refers, are: ‘The richest of these statues were covered with ivory, and here and there, (*ἀλγρον δσον*.) glittered with gold. Withinside they were supported by frames of wood, (*ἐπὶ ξύλοις*.) in which whole troops of mice took shelter, and formed their common wealth.’ (*ἀγέλαι μύων*.)¹

“ It seems to me remarkable that it is *not* stated by Pausanias or Pliny that the statue of Victory, of four cubits high, (therefore not a *Victoriola*.) stood, or was placed standing, on the extended right-hand of Minerva, which must include the arm, or there would be no extension. But Epictetus² does say so distinctly. Now if the *Victory* were solid of any metal, it must weigh down the arm, or break it, unless the inside of the limb were of brass, and that too attached to a metallic frame supporting the statue.

“ Supposing this state of the case, as far as relates to the outward appearance and internal machinery of the statues to be indisputable, a

¹ In the Jupiter Tragedy.

² Lib. ii. cap. 8.

question remains, which he, who can answer it in plain intelligible language, and not in terms of art, must have much more skill and sagacity than I can pretend to. My own superannuated thoughts have been wasted on it in vain. The figures of the god and goddess must have been composed and formed on a covered frame of some kind or other, and that frame supported throughout by internal bars of brass or wood. I ask what was the composition of that frame, and of the figures or shapes which were supported by it; and how, or by what medium or contact they were supported by the inside machinery? To me it appears that the forms, at least, of the statues must have been finished, before the *laminae* of gold and ivory could be applied to those forms by way of ornament or dress. Here I shall conclude this part of my meditations, with one note of admiration more to the statues. Is it possible, or is it conceivable, that Pausanias, Plutarch, and Pliny, should not have known the internal construction of these colossal statues, or that they should have believed or imagined that they were literally made of solid gold and ivory! On the subject of these wonderful works of art, there remains still one consideration, worthy of your taste and genius, and then you shall be at liberty, *portâ mittendus oburnâ*.

"The enormous disproportion of the size of these statues to the temples, which held them, must have been obvious to every eye. Nay, I should think, it must have been the *first* impression made on the spectator, the moment he entered the temple. Yet, if my utmost researches have not failed or misled me, it is certainly true that no ancient writer has taken notice, or, if at all, very slightly, of this manifest and striking disproportion, except Strabo, much less to account for it. The geographer says only that 'the greatest of all was the ivory statue of Jupiter, (*λεοφόριον ἵδιον*,) made by *Phidias*, of such a magnitude that, although the temple was of the greatest size, the artist seemed to have missed the mark, or failed, of symmetry (*between the statue and the temple*). He made the statue sitting, yet almost touching the roof with the summit of its head, giving an impression on the eye, that if the god were to rise and stand upright, he must unroof the temple.' In this place it is natural to ask a question, which, as far as my little learning reaches, has never been answered, Why, of all the single statues of the heathen celestial gods, the Jupiter alone is represented *sitting*? Because *he* was their supreme divinity. The others, even the Minerva, or Goddess of Wisdom, were his ministers or agents, and, as his inferiors, *stood* in his presence, whenever they were personified. *He* alone is not in action. *His* power is in repose, serene and majestic, and executes his pleasure, not by motion or command, but by pure volition.

"Is it to be believed that *Phidias* was not aware of a palpable violation of the laws of symmetry between his own work and the case which contained it? or that, seeing the fact, he should not have intended it? or that, with that intention, he should have had no rational purpose to be answered by it? *I'll not believe it*. The dimensions of so great an artist are not to be measured by the mere visual faculty of vulgar eyes. The altitude of such a being must be taken with a quadrant. First, undoubtedly he meant to magnify his statue at the expense of the temple; and, so meaning, the disproportion he resorted to, could not fail of its effect. So far a common caviller might accuse him of vanity. A critic of a higher order might content himself

with subscribing to the accurate and enlightened conclusion of Quintilian, who illustrates the statue of Jupiter by its moral impression: 'Cujus pulchritudo adjecisse aliquid etiam receptæ religioni videtur; adeo majestas operis deum æquavit.'

"Was that all? Had he no theory, of a more elevated ascent, in contemplation? Yes; I swear by the genius of Phidias himself, he had another purpose worthy of him, which he has left it to the statue to denounce. THE DEITY I REPRESENT, FILLS HIS OWN TEMPLE, AND LEAVES NO ROOM FOR ANY OTHER GOD."—*Extract from Sir Philip Francis' Letter Missive to Lord Holland.*

I consulted my intelligent and esteemed friend, the Rev. T. S. Hughes, B.D., on the subject, and he favored me with the following observations in his reply:

"With respect to the work *in toto*, it appears to me very like the effort of a man who did *not* write Junius, but wished it to be thought he *did*. It is clever, and has many pointed passages, but not the raciness of Junius's style. With regard to that part, to which you have particularly drawn my attention, I should say that the remarks of Sir Philip are in general very just and true. Those concerning the gold and ivory statues agree in the main with the great and splendid work of Quatre-Mere de Quincy on the Chryselephantine Statuary. With regard to the *Hecatompodon* (p. 64.) he is right—it was the old temple burnt and destroyed by the Persians, and a vast many of the stones which composed it, especially those of the pillars, are at this day to be seen, (according to the conjectures of able antiquaries,) worked up in the walls of the Acropolis. As for Stuart, though a fine architect, he was not a very accurate scholar. Sir Philip is wrong, when he says that only the statues of Jupiter were ever represented in a sitting posture: take the following instance of the contrary from Pausanias, (*Corinth*. 217.) Τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἡρας ἐπὶ θρόνου κάθηται μεγέθει μέγα, χρυσοῦ μὲν καὶ ἐλέφαντος, Πολυκλείτου δὲ ἔργον. His remark in capitals at the bottom of p. 72. seems to me a very happy one. In the words of Sir Philip, *vive et vale*."—*Appendicula. II.*

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

IN a work which the writer of this article has lately published, he has attempted to prove that in the Revelation of St. John the symbolical personage designated the Dragon, the old serpent called the Devil and Satan, is paganism. It is stated, as a canon for the interpretation of Scripture prophecy, "that every symbol should be considered as having the same import wherever it occurs:" and as commentators have generally been of opinion that Christianity conflicting with Paganism is indicated in the twelfth chapter of the Revelation by the war in heaven between Michael and his angels, and the Dragon and his angels; it is contended that the Dragon introduced again in the twen-

tieth chapter, and described in precisely the same terms, must also be Paganism ; and that paganism, at the commencement of the ninth century, was confined to a symbolical abyss by Charlemagne, king of France.

In accordance with this interpretation, the following translations and criticisms are submitted to the consideration of the reader. The Greek¹ of the fourth verse in the twentieth chapter may be literally rendered thus:—

“ I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them ; and I saw the souls of those that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God ; and whoever worshipped not the beast, nor his image, and took not the mark on their forehead or on their hand, and lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.”

The following is a free translation : “ And in the space of the thousand years, I saw thrones, and those who sat on them, to whom judgment was given ; and I saw the souls of those that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God ; and I saw those who worshipped not the beast, nor his image, and who received not his mark on their foreheads, or on their hands ; and I saw those who lived and reigned with Christ.”

The original Greek of this passage has had a singular fortune under the hands of translators. After the word *ψυχὰς*, souls, there is a participle in the perfect or pluperfect tense which is followed by four verbs, all aorists. The participle is in our common version rendered by a verb in the imperfect tense, which ought to have been in the pluperfect ; and of the verbs, the two former have been converted into the pluperfect, and the two latter have been left in the imperfect tense : but still worse than all this, the grammatical construction or government has been completely changed. I will not assert that the translators have done this capriciously, arbitrarily, or at random ; but I am disposed to think that if their minds had not been pre-occupied by a Jewish tradition, they would not have rendered the passage in the manner they have. Here seems to me to be a striking proof of the justness and importance of some observations of Dr. Chalmers, on the supreme authority of revelation. “ What is the reason,” he asks, “ why there is so much more unanimity among critics and grammarians about the sense of any ancient author than about the sense of the New Testament ? Because the one is made purely a

¹ Καὶ εἶδον θρόνους, καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς, καὶ κρίμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς· καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν πεπελεκισμένων διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ὄντες οὐ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ οὔτε τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔλαβον τὸ χάραγμα ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔζησαν καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ χίλια ἔτη. Rev. xx. 4.

But I foresee a formidable objection to my hypothesis. It will be said that the period of a thousand years, or the millenium, comprises not the whole series of particulars detailed in the passage under review, but should be considered as relating only to the last clause, and specifying the duration of the spiritual or personal reign of Christ on earth. To remove this objection I may observe, that persons or things enumerated in a sentence, and conjoined together, form a plurality: John and William and James are the Christian names of three of my sons; but the term "Christian names" cannot be predicated of John individually, or of William individually, or of James individually; it is only true of them collectively: Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter, are the four seasons of the year; but the substantive, seasons, cannot be predicated of spring separately, or of summer separately, or of autumn separately, or of winter separately; it is only applicable to them when taken together. The same observation is transferable to time. The apostle Paul states, that "God gave unto the people of Israel judges, about the space of four hundred and fifty years."¹ Not two or three judges for the whole period, nor two or three at one time followed by others in succession; but those magistrates were raised up one after another, and but one at a time sustained the office of judge. Othniel judged Israel forty years; Tola was judge twenty-two years; Jephtha six years; and Eli forty; and others were supreme magistrates of Israel for different periods. To none of these singly can the space of time mentioned by the apostle be applied, but to the sum of the periods during which they respectively governed, till the time of the prophet Samuel. The same inspired writer says, quoting from the Psalms, "Harden not your hearts as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness, *when*² your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years." Here a series of things both expressed and implied has a space of time assigned for dura-

¹ Acts xiii. 20.

² On this adverb, Dr. Macknight has the following observation:—"Where your fathers tempted me. This, which is the Syriac and the Vulgate translation, is more just than our English version, 'When your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works forty years.' For the word 'when' implies, that at the time of the bitter provocation the Israelites had seen God's works forty years: contrary to the history which sheweth, that the bitter provocation happened in the beginning of the third year from the Exodus. Whereas the translation in the Vulgate, agreeably to the matter of fact, represents God as saying, by David, that the Israelites tempted God in the wilderness during forty years, notwithstanding all that time they had seen God's miracles."—Apost. Epist. Note on Heb. iii. 9.

tion. The Israelites tempted God in the wilderness of sin, when they murmured for bread, and they proved him when he furnished them with manna. They tempted him at Rephidim, afterwards called Massah, where they murmured for water, and said, Is the Lord among us or not? And they proved him when he made water to issue from the rock in Horeb to remove their thirst. At Sinai they provoked God by making a golden calf, and worshipping the work of their own hands. At another place they tempted him by demanding flesh to eat, and they proved him when he sent quails to gratify their sensual appetites. In these and in a variety of other instances they tempted God, proved him, and saw his works forty years. The supply of manna and of water was indeed uninterruptedly continued, but in the other things there was a succession; and the sum of the series amounts to forty years. The words of the apostle may be arranged and translated in the same manner, as it has been proposed to render the verse which has been subjected to a critical examination: "Harden not your hearts as in the provocation, in the day of temptation in the wilderness; *where*, through the space of forty years, your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works."

W. F.

Idle, near Bradford,

Dec. 1828.

CORRUPTION OF DEMIURGUS.

IN the ancient Scholia on the Thebaid of Statius, which by some are ascribed to Lutatius, or Luctatius Placidus, or, as he is called by others, Placidus Lactantius, there is a passage in which it is asserted that the highest god, of whom Statius speaks in the 4th book, is called *Demogorgon*. But the lines in Statius where this occurs are as follow:

"Scimus enim et quidquid dici, noscique timetis,
Et turbare Hecaten, ni te, Thymbræe, vereris:
Et triplicis mundi summum, quem scire nefastum est:
Illum sed taceo."—Lib. iv. v. 514, &c.

"Dicit [Statius] Deum Demogorgona summum," says the scholiast. On this, however, Gale in his notes on the fifth section of Iamblichus de Mysteriis, rightly observes, "Cæterum Lactantii illum locum, a multis tentatum, libet hic in melius, ut spero, restituere.—Quis sit iste Demogorgon, vel, ut alii scribunt ineptè, Dæmogorgon? Wierus de Præst. Dæmonum inter Magos infames commemorat Dæmogorgona (aliis Damigeronta. Scholiastes Ms.) Adno-

tat ad Lucani VI. nescio quis scholiastes, "ipse Dæmogorgon ὀμῆαι Gorgone quam exteri timent superior." Atqui nomen hoc nusquam alibi extat, præterquam in hoc Lactantii loco corrupto. Lego igitur Demiurgum. "Cujus nomen (inquit Lactantius) scire non potest." Enimvero si nomen sit Dæmogorgon, jam illud scimus. Porro paucis infra Lactantius docet, se tradere ea, quæ scribit de Deo isto, ex Pythagora, Platone, et Tagetæ. Jam Demiurgus apud Platonem in Timæo ἀκατονομαστος."

Prior, however, to Gale, Farnaby appears to have conjectured that Dæmogorgon is the Demiurgus. For in his note on the lines in the sixth book of Lucan's Pharsalia,—

"Paretis? an ille

Compellendus erit, quo nunquam terra vocato
Non concussa fremit,"—

he observes: "Dæmogorgon Deorum princeps, sive Demiurgus ille sit (Platonis) Deus summus, omnium rerum creator, cujus nomen arcanum et ineffabile inter cætera Deorum nomina citare nefas, nisi summa urgente necessitate." But that Farnaby's Lucan was prior to the Iamblichus of Gale is evident. For the first edition of the former, as we learn from Fabricius, was Lond. 1618, 8vo. and the second edition, Francof. 1624, 8vo.; but of Gale's Iamblichus there is only one *edition*, and that was published at Oxford, 1678, fol. It is singular, therefore, that Gale should claim the merit of a discovery which Farnaby prior to him had made; and the singularity is greatly increased when we consider that Gale, being a scholar and a schoolmaster, ought not to have been ignorant of the contents of Farnaby's Lucan.

Gale, too, in asserting that the Demiurgus according to Plato in the Timæus is ἀκατονομαστος, i. e. *nameless*, is egregiously mistaken. For Plato says of this divinity in the Timæus: *τον μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός ευρεῖν τε ἐργόν, καὶ ευροντα, εἰς ἀπαντας ἀδύνατον λεγεῖν*: i. e. "It is therefore difficult to discover the maker and father of this universe, and, when found, it is impossible to speak of him to *all* men." But the Demiurgus or Jupiter, both according to the Chaldean and Grecian theology, is not the highest god; since he subsists at the extremity of the intellectual triad of gods, which consists of Saturn, Rhea, and Jupiter.¹ Hence he is not *perfectly ineffable*. Of the great first principle, however, of all things, or *the one*, Plato says in the Parmenides: *Οὐδ' ἀρα ὄνομα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ λόγος, οὐδὲ τις ἐπιστήμη, οὐδὲ αἰσθησις, οὐδὲ δοξα. Οὐ φαίνεται. Οὐδ' ὀνομαζέται ἀρα, οὐδὲ λέγεται, οὐδὲ δοξάζεται, οὐδὲ γινώσκεται, οὐδὲ τι τῶν ὄντων αὐτοῦ αἰσθάνεται. Οὐκ εἰκεν*: i. e. "Neither therefore does any name pertain to it, nor

¹ See this copiously and beautifully unfolded by Proclus in Plat. Theol. lib. v. And in the same book, p. 308. see also the above passage from the Timæus most satisfactorily explained.

discourse, nor any science, nor sense, nor opinion. It does not appear that there can. Hence, *it can neither be named nor spoken of*, nor conceived by opinion, nor be known, nor perceived by any being. So it seems."

To these two causes, viz. the *Demiurgus* and the *ineffable principle* of all things, Plato likewise alludes as follows, in his sixth Epistle: *Και τον των παντων Θεον ηγεμονα των τε οντων και των μελλοντων, τον τε ηγεμονος και αιτιου πατερα κυριον επομυνντας* *ον αν οντως φιλοσοφωμεν εισομεθα παντες σαφως εις δυναμιν ανθρωπων ευδαιμονων*: i. e. "And swearing by that God who is the leader of all things present and future, and by the father and lord of this leader and cause, whom we shall all of us, if we truly philosophise, clearly know, as far as this is possible to be effected by felicitous men." This likewise is corroborated by the following very remarkable passage from the works of Ficinus: "In Epistola ad Syracusanos inquit Plato, *Mundi quintiam architectum verbis exprimi vulgo non posse, testis est is meus, multo minus architecti patrem*."¹ Ficin. Op. tom. ii. p. 1189.

I only add, that Milton, notwithstanding his great learning, appears to have had no conception that the word *Demogorgon* is a corruption of *Demiurgus*: for in the second book of his *Paradise Lost*, v. 965, he says,

———— "and by them stood
Orcus and Ades, and the dreaded name
Of *Demogorgon*."

THOMAS TAYLOR.

Manor Place, Walworth.

ON THE WRITINGS OF AUSONIUS.

FROM the era of the civil wars to the reign of Trajan, the series of extant Latin poets, though unequally divided among the different periods, continues tolerably uninterrupted. Lucretius, Catullus,—the Augustan constellation, Phædrus, Lucan, Persius, and Seneca,—and last, and not least in number or excellence, the third great cluster of wits who illustrated the reigns of Domitian and Trajan—carry on, though not all in metal of the same purity or brightness, the chain of which Father Ennius was the commencing link. At this latter point, however, a great and remarkable chasm ensues. From the times of Trajan to those of Theodosius, a space of two hundred years, with the exception of the eclogues of Calpurnius, one or two indifferent ecclesiastical poets, and perhaps

¹ Where Ficinus found this passage I know not; for it is not in any of the Epistles of Plato that are now extant.

a few fragments, no relics of Roman poetry exist; and had the writings of Ausonius and Claudian likewise perished; (for Sidonius and his compeers are scarcely worth mentioning in this view, and the religious poets cannot well be considered as belonging to the old stock,) the line of *classical* Latin poets would have terminated with Juvenal, Martial, and Statius.

Of this literary phenomenon we shall not attempt the solution. How much is to be attributed to the usual ravages of time, how much to the wilful destruction of manuscripts, and how much to the inferior merit of the poets themselves, their transient popularity, or the diminished cultivation of the art, we leave it to others to inquire. It is more to our present purpose to observe, that, although the stamina of Roman poetry remained the same, the lapse of so many ages must have effected an important change in its accidents, in its forms, in its language, in the feelings which were its animating spirit, and in the subjects on which it was employed. True it is, that the effect was not more than proportionate to the cause; on the contrary, when all circumstances are considered, it is rather remarkable that so much of the original features of the muse of Latium remains discernible. This is more the case with Claudian than with Ausonius; for Claudian, whether owing to his own better judgment, or to the happy accident of his being born in a Grecian city, which emancipated him in a great measure from the influence of vernacular corruptions, as well as from other causes of deterioration, appears to have modelled himself, as far as was practicable, on the writers of a more fortunate era. He has certainly imbibed no small portion of their style and spirit; so much so, that though it would be going too far to class him unreservedly with the poets of the silver age, the affinity between them is very considerable; as they who are familiar at the same time with his writings, and with the *Sylvæ* and *Thebaid* of Statius, will at once acknowledge. Still, however, the transforming effects of time itself, the changes in manners and institutions, the gradual amalgamation of the conquered races with the conquerors, the introduction of a new religion, rooting up so many old national affections and substituting others in their stead; these and other co-operating causes cannot but have left a deep and visible impress on the Roman mind, and consequently on the Roman literature; and in passing, as in the present instance we are compelled to do, immediately from the authors of the one age to those of the other, we naturally expect to find alterations somewhat similar to those which take place in the features and disposition of an old acquaintance revisited by us after an absence of many years. Of this new character, as exhibited in the poetry of the nation, (for with the still greater revolutions in prose we have nothing to do,) Ausonius may be taken as the representative; both because in him it is more fully marked than in his contem-

porary,¹ and because, from the greater variety of his works, and the lighter subjects on which his talent is, in a great measure, employed, it has in him developed itself more minutely. To those; therefore, whose intimacy with the youth and manhood of Latin poetry is such as to make them feel an interest in the productions of its declining years, the works of Ausonius will be no unpleasing study. Of his personal merits and defects we shall shortly have to speak.

Of the life and fortunes of Ausonius (more fortunate in this respect than many greater men) copious information remains; owing partly, indeed, to his own communicativeness, and the personal nature of many of his writings. Decimus Magnus Ausonius was the son of Julius Ausonius, a physician of Bourdeaux, eminent alike for his professional skill and his private worth, concerning whom his son, in the first of the *Parentalia*, thus delivers the opinion of his surviving contemporaries:

Ut nullum Ausonius, quem sectaretur, habebat;
Sic nullum, qui se nunc imitetur, habet.

His mother, Æmilia Æonia, was descended from the ancient nobility of the Sequani. It was at the same city of Bourdeaux, then flourishing in arts and civilisation, and of which he may be considered as the oldest recorded worthy, that our poet was born. Having received an excellent education under the care of a learned relative, he began life as a schoolmaster; in which capacity he shortly rose to such eminence, that he attained to the rhetorical chair of Bourdeaux, one of those public professorships which, in imitation of Alexandria, had long been established in the principal cities of the empire. His fame still spreading, he was invited to Rome by the then emperor, Valentinian the First, who appointed him tutor to his son Gratian. By both these princes he was held in high regard. He accompanied Valentinian on several of his military expeditions; and on the accession of Gratian to the throne, was elevated successively to the prefectures of Illyricum and of Gaul, and finally (A.D. 374) to the consulship; which even in those days (see Claudian *de Consulatu Stilichonis*) was looked up to as one of the highest of human distinctions. Of his wife, Ottusia Lucana, from whom he was separated by death after a brief union, and for whose sake he continued a widower during the remainder of a long life, he has himself spoken in some touching verses. On the death of Gratian, though favored by

¹ We use this term with some latitude, inasmuch as, strictly speaking, the termination of Ausonius's literary career nearly coincided with the beginning of Claudian's. Considered, however, with regard to the place they occupy in the history of ancient poetry, and the state of literature which they indicate, they may be considered as contemporaries.

his successor Theodosius, he withdrew from public life, and retired to pass an old age of honorable tranquillity in his native city, where he died, towards the end of that century of which he was the most distinguished poet. Many other particulars respecting him may be found in his own works (especially the *Parentalia*), and in the various lives subjoined to the Variorum edition of his works. His character and opinions may be collected pretty accurately from his writings. Whether he was a Christian, has been questioned; but the important office which he held in the palace of Valentinian, together with some unequivocal indications in his poems, prove that he was a believer, although, perhaps, the tenets of Christianity may not have struck their roots very deeply in his affections. His morality, in general, is not much above the average morality of his heathen predecessors; the virtues he extols are the staple virtues of old Rome; and some of his epigrams approach the worst of Martial's in grossness. But it were unjust, and (if we may so express ourselves) almost unkind, to dwell on the dark side of a character which offers to our view so much that is amiable. His love of the country and its simplicity, his fondness for his native place, the affection with which he dwells on the memories of his kindred, his early friends, and his teachers, seem to indicate a gentleness and a benevolence of mind worthy of being associated with yet higher attributes. His letters to Paullinus, and a reply of the latter, (sometimes subjoined to the poems of Ausonius,) are beautiful pictures; the one of wounded yet not exacerbated affection, the other of an attachment almost filial, tempered by firm religious principle.

His poems are almost all short, and of various kinds; epigrams, epistles, occasional pieces, jeux d'esprit, translations from the Greek, &c. Nothing is more remarkable than their extreme inequality in point of merit; the line of Martial,

"Sunt mala, sunt quædam mediocria, sunt mala plura,"

may be applied with a variation to Ausonius: a few things are excellent, many good, and many downright bad. This countenances a conjecture which we have seen somewhere made, that the present collection consists in great part of the mere sweepings of his study, gathered together and published after his death. For it is observable that the faults of the pieces in question consist not so much in their execution, as in their impracticable subjects; they being, for the most part, tricks of metrical leger-de-main, or mere exercises of the pen, or whimsies, such as a man of talent might compose for the amusement of a private circle, but which no man of sense, still less one who could write as Ausonius has often done, would think of publishing. Even in these, it is true, his better qualities, terseness, elegance, and ingenuity, cannot help sometimes betraying themselves; but the graces of his manner serve only to render more conspicuous the flatness and absurdity

of his matter. But when the deadening weight of a dull subject, or the consciousness that he is writing "to order," are removed, and his fancy and his feelings are allowed their natural and genial play, he displays powers which, in a better age, would have raised him to a higher rank among poets than he now holds. Inequality, indeed, is far more the characteristic of Roman than of Grecian poets: were it worth while, the phenomenon might perhaps be explained from the nature and origin of either literature: but of all the Roman poets, Ovid and Lucan excepted, we know of none in whom it is so remarkable as Ausonius. He has failed often, and greatly; but he has also succeeded often, and in many kinds of composition. Indeed, if any one quality is to be specified as distinguishing him from his compeers, it is facility, or the power of doing many things well; all things, indeed, which require nothing more than grace, and some things which do. Unlike the many who grow stiff and feeble when removed from their peculiar province, he assumes with almost equal ease the person of the moral teacher, the epigrammatist, the painter of nature, and the poet of the friendly and domestic affections. Besides this general pliancy of talent, he possesses a certain mild pathos, not unallied to that which, like a beautiful vein, intersects the more ambitious parts of Virgil, and which is the chief attraction of the *Sylvæ* of Statius; but accompanied with, perhaps, a more minute analysis of the feelings to which it relates. To this we may add a power of satirical writing not altogether contemptible, though displaying itself but occasionally. His power over the Latin language, such as it was in his time, is very considerable: he is copious, idiomatic, flowing, frequently energetic, and very little of a copyist; and if he participates in the corruptions of his age, he certainly has no more than his share. Allowing, indeed, for these corruptions, both as regards manner and matter, he may be considered as the last heir of the lighter *veneres* of the Latin language. His successor struck into a different path. His calling was to illustrate the public events of a most momentous age: barbarian invasions, the rise and fall of statesmen, wars and treaties, involving in their results the fate of the civilised world; the deliverance of the western empire from famine by the overthrow of the tyrant Gildo, or of the eastern from ruin by the assassination of Rufinus, or the final overthrow of the tremendous Alaric on the mighty field of Pollentia. His subjects, therefore, naturally directed him to epic models; and in him, accordingly, we expect and find the more imposing qualities of the Latin poetical language, as modelled by Virgil and his more especial followers—its majesty, its ornament, and its balanced harmony; and when, as in the marriage of Honorius and some of his shorter pieces, his subject is such as to require a different style, he usually fails for want of flexibility. Ausonius, on the contrary, had studied and

successfully ingrafted on his own manner the elegancies of Horace and Tibullus, of Ovid and Martial; and the graces of language which are common to these, and which form in a great measure the peculiar character of the language, shine out again with diminished lustre in Ausonius, previously to their final extinction. It is the same voice of the Roman muse which we hear, enfeebled indeed by time and misfortunes, but still distinctly recognisable.

Among the poetical remains of Ausonius a few prose pieces are interspersed, the principal of which is a panegyric on his pupil and benefactor the Emperor Gratian. Of Ausonius's prose little need be said: it is easy and clear, as pure in its Latinity as the age would allow; and betraying, in its ample sweep and its florid and figurative diction, the poetical habits of the writer. Besides the pieces in prose and verse which are still extant, Ausonius composed a Roman Chronology, extending from the foundation of the city to his own times; with one or two other works of no great importance.

The volume opens with a collection of epigrams, 146 in number, on all manner of subjects, political, moral, satirical, amatory, &c. Several of them are translations from the Greek; a favorite practice with Ausonius, as was also the sportive intermixture of Greek with Latin in the same poems, and even in the same line. Like most of the epigrams of the later poets, they are cast chiefly in the mould of Martial. In this, as in most other points, Catullus stands alone among his countrymen. He was by nature a Greek poet, as much as Julius Cæsar was a Greek statesman: the colors with which he wrought his poetical pictures were too airy and subtle for the material apprehensions of his countrymen; and his example, splendid as it was, produced no permanent effect. The Latin epigram, in his hands, is a thing of a different kind from what it afterwards became. We are not of the mind of that critic, who annually sacrificed a copy of Martial to the manes of Catullus. Our creed is more comprehensive. Martial, is, indeed, incomparably inferior to Catullus; but it is an inferiority not of degree, but of kind; and we know not why two excellent things of different kinds should not exist amicably together. In his own way, Martial is almost perfect. He brought the Latin epigram to its popular and established shape; and as an epigrammatist he remains unrivalled, not only in his own language, but, to the best of our knowledge, in all the languages in which his model has been followed. Here, as in his other attempts, the success of Ausonius is very unequal. The every-day deeds of ordinary emperors and great men are, indeed, things heavy enough to break the back even of a vigorous Pegasus; but Ausonius frequently fails where there are no official trammels to impede him; he throws away a great deal of serviceable dexterity in punning on unlucky proper names, or twisting a moral sentence fifty ways. Where this is not

the case, however, we know no one, excepting always his great predecessor, who has turned the Latin epigram more successfully, either in point of satirical power, or as regards that terseness, that happy adaptation of the matter of the epigram to its framework, that freedom from botches in short, which in modern epigrams (English at least) seems almost unattainable. We have already alluded to the grossness of many of these pieces; it is but justice however to add, that they are in general reproofs of prevailing vices, rather than wilful indulgences in impurity. We shall quote two of these pieces as fair specimens.

Epig. LXXV. *In Eunomum medicum :*

Languentem Caium moriturum dixerat olim
Eunomus : evasit fati ope, non medici.
Paullo post ipsum videt, aut vidisse putavit,
Pallentem, et multa mortis in effigie.
Quis tu ? Caius, ait. Vivisne ? Hic abnuat. At quid
Nunc agis hic ? Jussu Ditis, ait, venio ;
Ut, quia notitiam Divûmque hominumque tenemus,
Accirem medicos. Eunomus obrigit.
Tum Caius : Metuas nihil, Eunome ; dixi ego et omnes,
Nullum, qui saperet, dicere te medicum.

Epig. CIV. *In duas sorores diversorum morum :*

Delia, vos miramur, et est mirabile, quod tam
Dissimiles estis, tuque sororque tua.
Hæc habitu casto, cum non sit, casta videtur ;
Tu, præter cultum, nil meretricis habes.
Cum casti mores tibi sint, huic cultus honestus ;
Te tamen et cultus damnat, et actus eam.

Passing over the "Ephemeris," a somewhat coxcomical account of the author's mode of spending the day, but which contains some things worth preserving, we come to the "Parentalia," a series of tributes to the memory of those of his family and kindred who had died before him ; not however in detail, like the poems on similar subjects in the *Sylvæ* of Statius, but more in the nature of a *catalogue raisonné* of the qualities and fortunes of the individuals ; somewhat between an elegy and an inscription. The design is pleasing and amiable ; and in the execution there is some variety, as well as some pathos. But the especial interest of these compositions is, that they serve to remind us of our fellowship with human nature in all circumstances and under all disguises. They show us (what in reading ordinary historians, such as Gibbon, we are apt to forget) that even in a corrupt age, and under the pressure of great public misfortunes, there were other things in existence besides corruption and calamity ; that filial and fraternal love, and the attachment to home, and the feeling of family honor, and private virtues, had still room wherein to unfold themselves and flourish. Like visits to some distant and little-explored country, against whose people we had conceived a somewhat excessive

prejudice, such intimations are at once enlightening and consoling. These pieces are followed by a similar series, entitled "*Professores Burdigalenses*," in which the lives, characters, and attainments of the professors, who in the time of Ausonius filled the several chairs of public instruction at Bourdeaux, are successively commemorated. They possess no great merit in themselves, but are valuable for the light they throw on the state of literature and of education in that country and age. Of the poems, or rather bundles of verses which immediately succeed, little need be said; they are at best nothing but ingenious trifles, possessing in some instances considerable interest for the antiquary, but none for the poetical reader: such are the "*Epitaphia Heroum*," from the Greek; the "*Tetrasticha de Cæsaribus*," a series of well-turned epigrams, illustrating in the way of *Memoria Technica* the reigns of the respective Cæsars; the "*Ordo Nobilium Urbium*," a description of the great cities of the earth and their glory, beginning with Rome and ending with his native city of Bourdeaux; the "*Ludus Septem Sapientum*," &c.

But the "*Idyllia*," or *Miscellanies*, cannot be passed over so lightly. Several of them indeed, as the "*Versus monosyllabis cœpti et finiti*," and that whimsical Southeian outpouring of erudition the "*Griphus Ternarius*," belong to the same class as the above-mentioned; but the Horatian "*Villula*," the "*Rosæ*," the "*Cupido cruci affixus*," and above all the "*Mosella*," are among the happiest of Ausonius's productions. This last, the longest of all his poems, is dedicated to the praises of his favorite river. The beauty of the stream itself, the neighboring scenery, and all the many topics of interest connected with it, are dwelt on with that warmth of home affections which is the finest feature in Ausonius's writings, with a luxuriant richness of painting, and in animated and flowing diction. It is remarkable that in this piece, and in one or two passages of his other poems, Ausonius seems to have forestalled the modern style of poetical description, in which the object described is dwelt on, and its minutest features set down, as things important in themselves, not merely as accessory to human action, or as influencing human passion, or colored by it. Take for instance the following lines:

— Glaucus opaco
Respondet colli fluuius : frondere videntur
Fluminei latices, et palmite consitus amnis.
Quis color ille vadis, seras cum protulit umbras
Hesperus, et viridi perfundit monte Mosellam?
Tota natant crispis juga montibus, et tremit absens
Pampinus, et vitreis vindemia turget in undis:
Annumerat virides derisus navita vites,
Navita caudiceo fluitans super æquora lembo,
Per medium, qua sese amni confundit imago
Collis, et umbrarum confuua conserit amnis.

Compare with this the descriptive passages in the Eclogues, for instance, or Georgics of Virgil. Among these Idyls is the too celebrated "Cento Nuptialis:" with regard to which, however, or rather with regard to the obnoxious passage with which it concludes, we may doubt whether it originated so much in a mere gloating love of impurity, as in the indulgence of a reckless ingenuity, glorying, with a kind of perverse triumph, in the dexterity with which the language and versification of Virgil had been forced into a combination with subjects so anti-Virgilian.

The "Epistles" are, on the whole, the most interesting of Ausonius's works. They are the natural effusions of his heart, his fancy, or his immediate humor, with little restraint except that produced by the consciousness of writing in verse. We may venture to diversify our monotonous criticism by one or two extracts. The following, from an epistle to his father on the birth of his (Ausonius's) son, strikes us as very pleasing:

(Ep. I.)

Credideram nil posse meis affectibus addi,
 Quo, venerande pater, diligere magis.
 Accessit (grates superis, medioque nepoti,
 Bina dedit nostris qui juga nominibus;
 Ipse nepos te fecit avum: mihi filius idem,
 Et tibi ego: hoc nato nos sumus ambo pares.)
 Accessit titulus, tua quo reverentia crescat;
 Quo doceam natum, quid sit amare patrem.
 Quippe tibi æquatus videor, quod parvulus isto
 Nomine honoratum te quoque nobilitat;
 Atque ætas quia nostra eadem: nam supparis ævi
 Sum tibi ego, et possum fratris habere vicem.
 Nec tantum nostris spatium interponitur annis,
 Quanta solent alios tempora dividere.
 Vidi ego natales fratrum distare tot annis,
 Quot nostros: ævum nomina non onerant:
 Pulchra juvena tibi senium sic jungit, ut ævum
 Quod prius est, maneat; quod modo, ut incipiat.
 Et placuisse reor geminis ætatibus, ut se
 Non festinato tempore utraque¹ daret;
 Leniter hæc flueret, hæc non properata veniret,
 Maturam frugem flore manente ferens.

The first epistle to Theon, though indulging too much in horse-play, is a good piece of sarcasm. The concluding lines of our extract almost rise to humor; a quality exceedingly rare among the later Latin wits.

¹ *Utrâque* for *utrâque*, and in like manner *eâdem*, are among the many corruptions in quantity (as in other matters) in Ausonius, which mark an age of incipient barbarism. Perhaps this particular instance originated in the popular accentuation.

Quid geris, extremis positus telluris in oris,
 Cultor arenarum vates? cui littus arandum,
 Oceani finem juxta, Solemque cadentem;
 Vilis arundineis cohibet quem pergula tectis,
 Et tingit piceo lacrymosa colonica fumo.
 Quid rerum Musæque gerunt, et cantor Apollo?
 Musæ non Helicone satæ, nec fonte caballi,
 Sed quæ fecundo de pectore Clementini
 Inspirant vacuos aliena mente poëtas.
 Jure quidem; nam quis malit sua carmina dici,
 Qui te securo possit proscindere risu?
 Hæc quoque ne nostrum possint urgere pudorem,
 Tu recita; et vere poterunt tua dicta videri.
 Quam tamen exerceas Medulorum in littore vitam?
 Mercatusne agitas, levioze numismate captans,
 Insanis quod mox pretiis gravis auctio vendat;
 Albentis sevi globulos, et pinguiæ ceræ
 Pondera, Naryciamque picem, scissamque papyrum,
 Fumantesque olidum paganica lumina tædas?
 An majora gerens, tota regione vagantes
 Prosequeris fures? qui te, postrema timentes,
 In partem prædamque vocant: tu mitis, et osor
 Sanguinis humani, condonas crimina nummis,
 Erroremque vocas, pretiumque imponis abactis
 Bubus, et in partem sceleris de judice transis.

Of the Epistles to Paullinus we have already spoken. The Panegyric on Gratian will not detain us long. Its characteristics are fluency, spirit (or rather perhaps vivacity), and somewhat of artificial smartness. We are reminded here of the professional rhetorician, as in some other places of the schoolmaster. One unpleasing feature, although too common in Roman writers to excite particular disgust here, is the extravagant strain of eulogy in which he indulges. Yet something may be said in extenuation of such offences. The feeling which prompts them is not necessarily unmixed servility: there is a spell in things present, a fascination which operates in some degree unavoidably on all except the strongest eyes; there is a charm also in rank, in authority, in hereditary institution; and where both these adventitious influences concur, the merits of the individual invested with them are sure to be over-rated by the bulk of mankind. But we must not run out into crude speculation. In Ausonius's case it should be observed, that a long friendship, and great benefits conferred on him by Gratian, might excuse some warmth of panegyric on his part. We can afford only one short quotation; it is not the best that might have been selected, but we prefer it as containing a lively description of a somewhat extraordinary ceremony.

Vel illud unum cujusmodi est, de condonatis residuis tributorum?
 Quod tu quam cumulata bonitate fecisti! Quis unquam imperatorum

Notice of Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia*. 113

hoc provinciis suis aut uberiore indulgentia dedit, aut certiore securitate prospexit, aut prudentia consultiore munivit? Fecerat et Trajanus olim; sed, partibus retentis, non habebat tantam oblectationem concessi debiti portio, quanta suberat amaritudo servati. Et Antoninus indulserat; sed imperii, non beneficii successor invidit, qui ex documentis tabulisque populi condonata repetivit. Tu argumenta omnia flagitandi publicitus ardere jussisti. Videre in suis quæque foris omnes civitates conflagrationem salubris incendii. Ardebant stirpes fraudum veterum, ardebant semina futura. Jam se cum pulvere favilla miscuerat, jam nubibus fumus involverat; et adhuc obnoxii in paginis concrematis ductus apicum, et sententiarum notas cum titubantia et trepidatione cernebant; quod meminerant lectum, legi posse etiam tunc verentes.

We have omitted mention of one or two unimportant fasciculi of verse; neither have we noticed his prefaces, which are frequently better than the poems they usher in. On the whole, Ausonius appears to be fully entitled to the rank which he holds among the minor poets of Rome; and if we were to describe in one sentence the impression which the perusal of his collective works left on our minds, we should say that they contain so much good poetry, and so much beauty of sentiment, as to make us regret that the proportion of good to bad, in both instances, was not greater.

NOTICE OF

“TRAVELS IN ARABIA; comprehending an Account of those Territories in Hedjáz which the Mohammedans regard as sacred.” By the late JOHN LEWIS BURCKHARDT. 4to. London, 1829. Pr. 2l. 2s. Colburn.

THE high reputation of Burckhardt as an intrepid and accomplished traveller has for some years been established throughout Europe by the accounts of his expeditions to Nubia and to Syria, published in two quarto volumes. The celebrity so justly acquired by those publications (a celebrity which we regret to designate posthumous, for the author died at Cairo in 1817,) will not, if our judgment be correct, suffer any diminution from the appearance of his *Arabian Travels*. Respecting this work, the editor, Sir William Ouseley, having observed in his preface, that to the former portions of Burckhardt's writings success was insured not only by intrinsic merit, but by the fame of their editor (Colonel Leake), as a scholar and antiquary, a traveller and a geographer, adds—

VOL. XXXIX. Cl. Jl. NO. LXXVII. H

"It must not, however, be inferred from any delay in publishing the present volume, that its contents are less worthy of notice than those parts which have already proved so interesting and instructive to a multitude of readers. It was always intended that this journal and other writings of the same lamented author should issue successively from the press."—"There still remains," says Colonel Leake in his Preface to the Syrian Journal, (p. ii.) "manuscripts sufficient to fill two volumes: one of these will consist of his Travels in Arabia, which were confined to the Hedjás or Holy Land of the Muselmáns, the part least accessible to Christians: the fourth volume will contain very copious remarks on the Arabs of the Desert, and particularly the Wahabys."

As some important literary occupations prevented Col. Leake from superintending the progress of this volume through the press, Sir Wm. Ouseley undertook the task, adopting almost invariably the Colonel's plan in his edition of the former works: "particularly," says Sir William, "in expressing with scrupulous fidelity the author's sentiments on all occasions, and in retaining, without any regard to mere elegance of style or selection of terms, his original language wherever an alteration was not absolutely necessary, to reconcile with our system of phraseology and grammatical construction certain foreign idioms which had crept into his English writings." (Pref. p. vi.)

It must here be recollected that Burckhardt was a Swiss, born at Lausanne, and descended from an eminent family of Basle. But it is not merely the author's name that recommends this volume; the country which it describes is most particularly interesting.

In p. ix. the editor quotes a passage from Sir Wm. Jones, who says,

"the manners of the Hejázi Arabs have continued from the time of Solomon to the present age;"

and another from Gibbon, who observes, that

"our notions of Mecca must be drawn from the Arabians. As no unbeliever is permitted to enter the city, our travellers are silent; and the short hints of Thevenot are taken from the suspicious mouth of an African renegade."

But in Burckhardt's narrative we find an authentic and interesting account of the most solemn ceremonies which he witnessed at Mekka and Medina, and of the extraordinary people among whom he lived in the character of a Muselmán.

Supposing the reader to know (as related at the close of his Nubian Travels) that he had crossed the Red Sea from Africa to Arabia, our author abruptly begins this volume with the following words:

"My arrival in the Hedjás was attended with some unfavorable circumstances. On entering the town of Djidda in the morning of the 18th July, 1814, I went to the house of a person on whom I had a letter of credit, delivered to me at my departure from Cairo in January

1813, when I had not yet fully resolved to extend my travels into Arabia. From this person I met with a very cold reception: the letter was thought to be of too old a date to deserve notice: indeed, my ragged appearance might have rendered any one cautious," &c.

Here the immediate want of a sum sufficient to defray his daily expenses obliged him, though very reluctantly, to sell a faithful and affectionate slave, for whom he entertained a regard. This slave had cost him sixteen dollars at Shendy, and was sold in the market at Djidda for forty-eight dollars.

"Thus," says he, "the profits of sale on *one* slave defrayed almost the whole expense of the four months' journey through Nubia which I had performed in the spring." (p. 8.)

From a physician named Yahya Effendi, who had heard a favorable report of our traveller at Cairo, he received three thousand piastres (about 100*l.*) for a bill on his friends in that city; and he was soon after invited by the Pasha to visit him at Tayf. As the invitation of a Turkish ruler is a polite command, he found it expedient to comply; and having minutely described Djidda, its commerce, the various commodities sold in its shops, the manners of its inhabitants and other matters, he set out for Tayf (five days distant from Djidda); and on his arrival there alighted at the house of Bosari, the Pasha's physician, whom he had known at Cairo. Under the name of Sheikh Ibrahim, Burckhardt declared himself to have been for some years a proselyte to the Mohammedan faith: yet he had reason to apprehend that Bosari watched him as a spy; and the Pasha had jocosely observed, "it is not the beard alone which proves a man to be a true Moslem." The Kadhy of Mekka (who happened then to be at Tayf,) remarked, that as none but a Moslem could be permitted to see the holy cities (Mekka and Medina), a circumstance of which our author could not be ignorant, he was inclined to suppose him a true believer, as he professed himself. Some difficulties on this subject being removed, Burckhardt had several interviews with the Pasha, and some extraordinary conversation of which he relates the particulars, (p. 77 et seq.). After some questions and answers the Pasha said,

"How did you pass your time among the blacks? I related some laughable stories, with which he seemed greatly amused. And now, Sheikh Ibrahim, where do you mean to go? I wish to perform the Hadj (or pilgrimage to Mekka), return to Cairo, and then proceed to visit Persia. (I did not think it advisable to mention my design of returning into the interior of Africa.) May God render smooth the way before you! but I think it folly and madness to travel so much. What, let me ask, is the result of your last journey? Men's lives are predestined: we all obey our fate. For myself, I enjoy great pleasure in exploring new

and unknown countries, and becoming acquainted with different races of people. I am induced to undertake journeys by the private satisfaction that travelling affords, and I care little about personal fatigue.—Have you heard the news from Europe?—Only some vague reports at Djidda. The Pasha then gave me an account of the events which ended in Bonaparte's banishment to Elba after the entrance of the allies into Paris. Bonaparte, he said, behaved like a coward; he ought to have sought for death rather than expose himself in a cage to the laughter of the universe. The Europeans, he said, are as treacherous as the Osmanlys (or Turks); all Bonaparte's confidants abandoned him, all his generals who owed to him their fortunes."

The Pasha inquired eagerly about the political relations between England and Russia. He seemed to fear that the English army which had been employed in the South of France would now be at liberty to invade Egypt. "The great fish swallow the small," he said, "and Egypt is necessary to England in supplying corn to Malta and Gibraltar." In the course of these conversations the geographical knowledge of his Turkish highness did not appear to great advantage; he confounded Geneva with Genoa, and Sweden with Switzerland. (p. 81.)

On his way from Tayf to Mekka, our author in passing by Wady Mohram assumed the *ihram*, a particular dress of the hadjys or pilgrims who visit the sacred territory; and we learn in a note that, according to Arabian historians, the Khalifah

"Haroun Br'rashid and his wife Zobeyda once performed the pilgrimage on foot from Baghdad to Mekka, clothed only with the *ihram*: that at every station of the caravan there was a castle with apartments splendidly furnished; and that the whole road was covered daily with carpets on which they walked." (p. 89.)

Burckhardt's companions on this journey were some soldiers, who, it appears, did not think it necessary to take the *ihram*, although positively ordained by the law as the duty of all who travel towards the holy city. At a coffee-hut, where they halted during the mid-day hours, he remarked the dexterity of some Bedouins who were shooting at a mark, and frequently hit a piastre which he placed at about forty yards from them.

When they arrived at Mekka, his companions the soldiers went off to visit their acquaintances, leaving him in a place where he knew not one human being.

"Whoever enters Mekka," says he, "whether pilgrim or not, is enjoined by the law to visit the temple immediately, and not to attend to any worldly concern whatever before he has done so. We crossed the line of shops and houses up to the gates of the mosque, where my ass-driver took his fare, and set me down; here I was accosted by half a dozen *metouef*, or guides, to the holy places, who knew from my being dressed in the *ihram* that I intended to visit the kaaba. I chose one of them as my guide; and after having deposited my baggage in a

neighboring shop, entered the mosque at the gate called *Babes' Salam*, by which the new-comer is recommended to enter."

He then describes the various ceremonies performed on visiting the temple in a brief manner; for a complete detail would, he says, prove extremely tedious: many voluminous works in Arabic treat of nothing else. (p. 94.)

We shall but slightly notice the prayers recited on first sight of the kaaba: the two *rikats*, the four prostrations, in thanks for having reached that holy spot, the prayers before the black stone of the kaaba, two more *rikats*, the touching or kissing of the stone, the *towaf* or walk round the kaaba repeated seven times, the drinking of the holy water of the well Zemzem, and other ceremonies indispensable on this occasion. Our author, having duly performed all, had part of his head shaved, and remained in the barber's shop, not knowing any place of repose; he inquired after lodgings, but found that the town was full of pilgrims, and that many were expected who had engaged apartments. At last he was enabled to hire a ready-furnished room; and having no servant, he agreed to board with the owner, whose family, a wife and two children, retired into a small open court-yard on the side of our traveller's room. Although even the second class of Mekkans lived in a style superior to that with which his landlord treated him, yet his charges amounted to fifteen piastres a day: several articles of his dress were pilfered;

"but," adds he, "this was not all: on the feast-day he invited me to a splendid supper, in company with half a dozen of his friends, in my room; and on the following morning he presented me with a bill for the whole expense of this entertainment." (p. 100.)

During the fast of Ramadhán, thousands of lamps illuminated the great mosque, which became the nightly resort of all foreigners at Mekka: the scene altogether presented a spectacle which (excepting the absence of women) resembled rather an European assemblage, than what could have been expected in the sanctuary of the Mohammedan religion.

"Mekka may be styled a handsome town; its streets are in general broader than those of Eastern cities; the houses lofty, and built of stone; and the numerous windows that face the streets give them a more lively and European aspect than those of Egypt or Syria, where the houses present but few windows towards the exterior. Mekka (like Djidda) contains many houses three stories high: few at Mekka are white-washed; but the dark grey color of the stone is much preferable to the glaring white that offends the eye in Djidda. In most towns of the Levant the narrowness of a street contributes to its coolness; and in countries where wheel-carriages are not used, a space that

allows two loaded camels to pass each other is deemed sufficient. . At Mekka, however, it was necessary to leave the passages wide for the innumerable visitors who here crowd together; and it is in the houses adapted for the reception of pilgrims and other sojourners that the windows are so contrived as to command a view of the streets." (p. 104.)

Our author minutely describes the different quarters of Mekka and the chief articles to be found in the shops. Some Indians retail strings of coral and false pearls, rosaries made of aloe, sandal or kalembac wood, brilliant necklaces of cut cornelians, and China ware: but much prejudice exists in Arabia against those Indians who are regarded as idolaters, although they outwardly comply with all that the Mohammedan law requires: they are supposed to be of the Ismayeley sect; those mysterious devotees of whom Burckhardt gives an account in his Syrian travels. (See his *Journey to Lebanon*.) About a dozen of those Indians reside at Mekka, scrupulously performing all the Moslem rites and ceremonies, but living wholly among themselves in one large house, never allowing strangers to occupy any part of it; even should several of the apartments be untenanted.

"Contrary to the practice of all other Mohammedans, these Indians never bring their women to the pilgrimage, although they could well afford the expense; and those residing for however long a period at Mekka have never been known to marry there, which is the more remarkable, as other natives of India, who live here for any length of time, usually take wives, although they may have been already married at home."

Of these people the same stories were prevalent which were related concerning the Ismayeys: our author inquired in vain for information on their secret doctrines, but he heard that a sect of light-extinguishers existed in India as well as in Mesopotamia: to these perhaps belong the Ismayeys of Syria and of Mekka. (p. 120.)

In the street called Soueyga, Abyssinian slaves of both sexes are exposed for sale: beauty being an universal attraction, this place is frequented by hadjys (or pilgrims) old and young, who often pretend to bargain with the dealers that they may have an opportunity of viewing the slave-girls, during a few moments, in some adjoining apartment. "The price of the handsomest was from one hundred and ten to one hundred and twenty dollars." (p. 120.) This would sufficiently prove that the hadjys or pilgrims did not pass their time at Mekka wholly in religious meditations, or in acts of devotion; and to admire female beauty, or even to purchase slave-girls, (however incon-

sistent with the sacred character of Mekka) seems a mere feather in the scale of guilt, when we consider such excessive depravity as that to which an allusion is made at the end of the following passage, where the editor found it necessary to condense within the compass of a few lines several details on the same subject absolutely inadmissible in an English publication, as a gentleman assures us who has seen Burckhardt's original manuscript:

"It is only during the hours of prayer that the great mosques of these countries partake of the sanctity of prayer, or in any degree seem to be regarded as consecrated places. In El Azhar, the first mosque at Cairo, I have seen boys crying pancakes for sale, barbers shaving their customers, and many of the lower orders eating their dinners, where, during prayers, not the slightest motion, nor even whisper, diverts the attention of the congregation. Not a sound but the voice of the Imáns is heard during prayers in the great mosque at Mekka; which, at other times, is the place of meeting for men of business to converse on their affairs; and is sometimes so full of poor hadjys, or of diseased persons lying about under the colonnade, in the midst of their miserable baggage, as to have the appearance of an hospital rather than a temple. Boys play in the great square, and servants carry luggage across it, to pass by the nearest route from one part of the town to the other. In these respects the temple of Mekka resembles the other great mosques of the East. But the holy kaaba is rendered the scene of such indecencies and criminal acts, as cannot with propriety be more particularly noticed. They are not only practised here with impunity, but, it may be said, almost publicly; and my indignation has often been excited on witnessing abominations which called forth from other passing spectators nothing more than a laugh or a slight reprimand." (p. 150.)

On some occasions the whole square and the colonnades of the temple are illuminated by thousands of lamps, besides which most of the hadjys bring each his own lantern. This brilliancy and the cool breeze that pervades the square, induce multitudes to linger here till midnight. Our ingenious author was once present when an enthusiastic pilgrim from Darfour arrived at this imposing scene on the last night of the Ramadhán fast, after a long journey over many barren and wearisome deserts: on his entrance into the illuminated temple he was so overawed and affected that he fell prostrate, and remained a considerable time in that posture of adoration. He then rose, and instead of reciting the usual prayers of a visitor, only exclaimed, with a flood of tears, "O God! now take my soul, for this is Paradise." (p. 160.)

But on the termination of the hadj or pilgrimage, this mosque assumes a very different appearance; poverty and disease fill it with dying and dead. Many pilgrims

"drag their emaciated bodies along the columns ; and, when no longer able to stretch forth their hands to ask the passengers for charity, they place a bowl to receive alms near the mat on which they lay themselves. When they feel their last moments approaching, they cover themselves with their tattered garments ; and often a whole day passes before it is discovered that they are dead. For a month subsequent to the conclusion of the hadj, I found almost every morning corpses of pilgrims lying in the mosque : myself and a Greek hadjy, whom accident had brought to the spot, once closed the eyes of a poor Mogreby pilgrim, who had crawled into the neighborhood of the kaaba to breathe his last, as the Moslems say, 'in the arms of the prophet and of the guardian angels.' He intimated by signs his wish that we should sprinkle Zemzem water over him ; and while we were doing so he expired : half an hour afterwards he was buried." (p. 161.)

Our accomplished traveller devotes a long and very interesting chapter to his remarks on the inhabitants of Mekka and Djidda, whose character and manners he illustrates by a variety of curious and entertaining anecdotes : from these, however, the limits of our notice oblige us to hasten, that we may accompany him from Mekka to Medina. He left the former city on the 15th of January, 1815, with a small caravan of pilgrims going to pay their devotions at the prophet's tomb. Among his companions were some Malays, whose opinions respecting the English he contrived to learn : they showed a determined rancor and hostility towards their present masters, and greatly censured their manners ;

"of which, however, the worst they knew was that they indulged too freely in wine, and that the sexes mixed together in social intercourse : none, however, impeached the justice of the government, which they contrasted with the oppression of their native princes ; and although they bestowed on the British the same opprobrious epithets with which the fanatic Moslems everywhere revile Europeans, they never failed to add — *but their government is good.*' I have overheard many similar conversations among the Indians at Djidda and Mekka, and also among the Arabian sailors who trade to Bombay and Surat : the spirit of all which was, that the Moslems of India hate the English, though they love their government." (p. 297.)

We must rapidly pass over the thirteen days' march from Mekka to Medina (including a halt of two days). In this city our author procured a lodging not far from the great mosque ; but was immediately called by the Mezowar or guide to visit the holy tomb of Mohammed : it being the duty of all strangers to perform that religious task before they undertake the most trifling or important business. (p. 317.)

But the ceremonies of Medina he found much easier and shorter than those of Mekka : a quarter of an hour sufficed for the performance of all. Here he again met Yahya Effendi, the Pasha's physician ; and was unluckily induced by his report

of the illness that affected many persons, to give him half a pound of bark which he had brought in his medicine-sack. Two days after he was himself attacked by a violent fever. As it was intermittent, he wished to take some bark; but on application to the physician, he declared that the last dram had been distributed: his fever increased; and our author was at last reduced to such a state of weakness, that he was unable to rise from his carpet without the assistance of his slave;

"a poor fellow," says he, "who, by habit and nature, was more fitted to take care of a camel than to nurse his drooping master."

Here he suffered much until the middle of April; but the bad water and unwholesome climate made him extremely desirous of leaving Medina. At length, finding himself just strong enough to mount a camel, he contracted with a Bedouin to conduct him as far as Yembo on the sea-coast, whence he might embark for Egypt; and having made a plan of the town, and collected the best information respecting it (which he gives in a particular chapter), he describes the various places adjoining, which partake of the sanctity of the mosque; and his remarks on the inhabitants of Medina are curious and interesting. As to the prophet's tomb, our readers will probably not feel disappointed. "The stories once prevalent in Europe respecting its being suspended in the air are unknown in the Hedjáz." (p. 333.)

At Medina it is thought indecorous that women should enter the mosque; even in their houses few females pray, except a few devout old ladies. Being regarded in the East

"as inferior creatures, to whom some learned commentators on the Koran deny even the entrance into paradise; their husbands care little about their strict observance of religious rites; and many of them even dislike it, because it raises them to a nearer level with themselves: and it is remarked that the woman makes a bad wife who can once claim the respect to which she is entitled by the regular reading of prayers." (p. 348.)

The mother of Tousoun Pasha appeared at Medina with all the pomp of an Eastern queen, and was regarded as an angel on account of her donations to the temple and to the poor. On her son she bestowed presents to the value of 25,000*l.*; twelve complete suits, including every article of dress from the finest Cashmere shawls to the slippers; a diamond ring worth 5000*l.*, and two beautiful Georgian slaves. But we must refer to the volume itself for many interesting anecdotes and remarks on the inhabitants of Medina—its government, climate, and diseases; and accompany our author from that city (which he left on the 21st of April, 1815,) to Yembo, where he arrived on the 27th in a very feeble state of health.

122 Notice of Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia*.

Here the plague had just commenced its ravages ; a rare occurrence in the province of Hedjáz.

Ships may anchor with safety in the deep bay of Yembo, which is a very cheap place with respect to provisions ; but so infested with clouds of innumerable flies, that in eating it is impossible to avoid swallowing some with every mouthful. On the 15th of May our invalid traveller embarked in an open *jambouk*, or large boat, bound to Cosseir, and arrived at Sherm on the 5th of June, whence he proceeded by land to Cairo in company with some soldiers and two men of Damascus ; but he halted several days at a village called El Wady, where he was kindly treated, and recovered a little strength. Arriving at Cairo on the 24th, he found that the plague had nearly subsided—that the Christians had already re-opened their houses ; but that a great gloom still overspread the town from the mortality which had occurred.

To the account of Burckhardt's *Travels in Arabia* are annexed, from his papers, ten articles forming the Appendix : of these articles, No. I. shows the route of the pilgrim caravan through the country between Mekka and Sanaa in Yemen. No. II. describes the country through which the Kebsy pilgrims travel, and the extraordinary customs of some Arabian tribes. No. III. the route from Tayf to Sanaa. No. IV. Notices of the country south of Mekka. No. V. Stations of the Hadj or pilgrim caravan from Cairo to Mekka. No. VI. Geographical notices of the country northward and eastward of Medina. No. VII. Postscript to the description of the Beitullah or Mosque at Mekka. No. VIII. Philological observations. No. IX. Topographical notices of the valley of Mekka and its mountains, extracted from the history of Azraky. No. X. Additional notes. From all these our limits will admit but of one extract, which we make from No. II. Speaking of certain Arab tribes, the author mentions that, until they learned from the Wahabys some true principles of Mohammedanism, they knew nothing more of their religion than its creed, "*La Illaha ill' Allah*," &c.—"There is no God but God, and Mohammed is the prophet of God."

"The El Merekede, a branch of the great Asyr tribe, indulged in an ancient custom of their forefathers, by assigning to the stranger who alighted at their tents or houses some female of the family to be his companion during the night, most commonly the host's own wife ; but to this barbarous system of hospitality young virgins were never sacrificed. If the stranger rendered himself agreeable to his fair partner, he was treated next morning with the utmost attention by his host, and furnished on parting with provisions sufficient for the remainder of his journey ; but if, unfortunately, he did not please the lady, his cloak was found next day to want a piece, cut off by her as a signal of con-

tempt. This circumstance being known, the unlucky traveller was driven away with disgrace by all the women and children of the village or encampment. It was not without much difficulty that the Wahabys forced them to renounce this custom: and as there was a scarcity of rain for two years after, the Merekedes regarded this misfortune as a punishment for having abandoned the laudable rites of hospitality practised during so many centuries by their ancestors. That this extraordinary custom prevailed in the Merekede tribe I had often heard during my travels among the Syrian Bedouins, but could not readily believe a report so inconsistent with our established notions of the respect in which female honor is held by the Arabs; but I can no longer entertain a doubt on the subject, having received, both at Mekka and Tayf, from various persons who had actually witnessed the fact, most unequivocal evidence in confirmation of the statement." (p. 448.)

For a variety of curious and entertaining information we must again refer to the work itself, which forms a very handsome volume, printed by Valpy, and embellished with four plans and a general map, illustrating not only Burckhardt's route in the Hedjâz, but several of the Itineraries given from original authorities in the Appendix; constituting altogether a most important and valuable addition to our stock of authentic and interesting travels.

CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM GRÆCARUM;
auctoritate et impensis Classis Historicæ et Philologicæ
Academiæ Literarum Borussicæ edidit AUGUSTUS
BOECKHIUS, Academiæ Socius. *Berolini, ex offi-*
cina Academica. Vendit G. Reimer, Libraria, Vol. i.
Fasciculus primus, 1825: pag. 1—292. Fasciculus
secundus, 1826: pag. 293—572. Fol.

PART II.—[Continued from No. LXXIII.]

WE have already given in a preceding number a preliminary article on this important work, published under the sanction and at the expense of the Royal Academy of Berlin. We took a general view of the plan of the work, and promised our readers to communicate to them in a condensed manner the substance of illustrative matter, by which the learned editor has rendered his work so useful and interesting to the scholar and archæologist; and we proposed, without entering into the minute details of palæographical controversy, to lay before them such inscriptions as have either been inedited before, or on which the erudition and the divinatorial faculties of the editor have thrown a new

light and interest. Boeckh himself intends giving a palæographical commentary at the end of the work; but the principles which guided him with reference to palæography, may already be collected from *Pars Prima*, which bears the title,—*Tituli antiquissima scriptura forma insigniores*.

The inscription at the head of it shows already that “doctors disagree.” It is the inscription found by Gropius the Austrian Consul at Athens in the neighborhood of Crissa, and which Rose has rejected as spurious, because he could make neither head nor tail of it. From personal acquaintance with Gropius, we happen to know, that he does not understand the ancient Greek, and this settles the question about the genuineness of the inscription. Boeckh reads thus:

Ἀθητοῦς υἱῆ, ὃς ἄφθιτος αἰεὶ εἰ
 Ἀρ[ι]στον σ' ἔθηκε καὶ τε Βοία καὶ Κ[αλλικ-
 λεία] καὶ Ἀγασιθία θυγατρὲς ὡς φίλοι.

On the stone only the letters *ετος* were legible, and even the *τ* is doubtful; but as the Delphic Apollo was worshipped at Crissa, the conjecture of B. is extremely probable. In support of *ἄφθιτος* p. ἄφθιτος, he refers to *τίτθη*, *Σακφῶ*, *Βάκχος*. Hermiann objected to the Homeric *καὶ τε*, but Pausan. viii. 21, 2. writes *καὶ ἐς Εἰλείθυιάν τε*. The inscription runs on the stone from the right to the left in the manner used by the Orientals, the Greeks of the highest antiquity, and the Etruscans.

Insc. 3. is commonly called Insc. Naniana, from a column brought by Nani from the island of Melos. In a palæographical point of view, it is one of the most remarkable inscriptions, not only for the singular form of several letters, but especially because there occur in it *KΣ* instead of *Ξ*; *ΠΗ* instead of *Φ*, and *KH* instead of *Χ*. Still there is no reason to doubt its genuineness, as Thiersch has done. B. reads it thus:

Παῖ Διὸς Ἐκφάντω δέξαι τόδ' ἀμενφὲς ἀγαλμα
 σοὶ γὰρ ἐπευχόμενος τοῦτ' ἐτέλεσσε γράφων.

Where we put *φ*, *χ*, *ξ*, the inscription has the tenuis with the sign of the spiritus asper as marked above. That the Greeks used to write thus in early times, is proved by a passage from Bekker; Anecd. T. ii. Schol. Dionys. Thrac. p. 780. ἀντὶ δὲ τῆς ἐκφωνήσεως τοῦ φ ἔγραφον τὸ π, προστιθέντες τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς σημεῖον τῆς δασείας, &c. Cf. Priscianus p. 542. lib. i. cap. de numero literarum, et Plinius H. N. vii. 58. B. supposes this inscription to belong to the age of Solon or Pisistratus. The inhabitants of Melos were Dorians; and Hermann says, Proxima veterrimæ Græcorum linguæ erat Dorica. On the Spartan colony at Delos, Boeckh refers to Canon. Narrat. c. 36, Plutarch. de Virt. Mulier. p. 273. T. viii. ed. Tub. Herod. viii.

48. Thucyd. v. 84. et 112. Xenoph. H. Gr. II, 2, 3. The following translation is given by Boeckh : Jove gnate, ab Ecphanto accipe hocce sine reprehensione elaboratum donarium : tibi enim supplicans hoc perfecit scalpendo. Apollo, the ἀρχηγέτης of the Dorians, is the Jove gnatus. Ecphantus is a name which occurs in Suid. v. Μουσαῖος : Demosth. de Cor. ἀχαισθαί τινι, accipere ab aliquo, is found in Homer : cf. Porson. ad Eurip. Hecub. p. 45. ed. Lips. Pindar. Pyth. iv. 21. ἀμεμφές l. ἀμεμφές is found in a few other texts. Ἄγαλμα was a general term for any work dedicated to the gods. Tim. Lex. Plat. ἄγαλμα : πᾶν ἀνάθημα : therefore the column was probably without any statue upon it ; ἐπευχόμενος is given by supplicans, because it would require εὐχόμενος ἀνέθηκε if the column had been offered de voto : γρόφων p. γράφων Dorice, as μαλάχη μαλόχη, and γράφων p. γλάφων, excavans, scalpens. Welcker reads Τρόφων as a noun proper, and supposes Ecphanto to be an epithet of Diana, φῶς δὲ ἐκφαίνει (II. Γ. 103.), which opinion he has retained in his Sylloge Epig. just published, Bonn. 1828.

Inscription 4. (Petilia.)

Θεὸς, Τύχα Σαῶτις διδ
ωτι Σικαίνια τῶν Foi
κίαν καὶ τ' ἄλλα πάντ
α· Δαμιουργός· Παραγός
ας· Πρόξῃνοι· Μίνκων·
'Αρμοξίδαμος· Ἀγάθαρ
χος· Ὀναῖς· Ἐπικωρ
ος·

The inscription is on a brazen tablet, and contains no long vowels nor any double consonant, except ξ in the shape of ϝ. Boeckh translates thus : Deus, Fortuna *adsint*. Saotis dat Sicæniæ domum suam et reliqua omnia. Demiurgus Paragoras, &c. Θεὸς, τύχα, as in Latin Patres (et) Conscripti, the καὶ being left out. Σαῶτις the name of a female ; there occurs Σάωτας, whence Σῶτις and Σαῶτις. The whole is a will, by which Saotis makes over her house and property to Sicænia, and a Demiurgus and five Proxeni are taken as witnesses. Δημιουργός was the name of a magistrate in Dorian towns,—Hesych. v. Δημιουργός : and Boeckh supposes that the inscription designates the magistratus eponymus of the town ; and as Herod. vi. 37. mentions, that the kings at Sparta appointed public officers called Proxeni, the five Πρόξῃνοι at Petilia might also have been magistrates. How they came to affix their name to a will, is explained by Boeckh in a singular manner. Assum-

ing that at Petilia; as in other Dorian towns, no stranger could be left a legacy, or be appointed universal heir, the names of the Proxeni, who generally exercised public hospitality towards strangers, are to testify that no such stranger had been appointed as heir. It would rather appear that an exception had been made in this instance in favor of Sicania, whose name already denotes a stranger, as Syrus, &c. and that in order to ensure the validity of the will, the Proxeni, together with the chief magistrate, were appointed as witnesses or executors.

Inscription 8. is the Sigeian, which is known well enough. This inscription has given rise to innumerable discussions; and Boeckh's opinion about it has since been again refuted at great length by Hermann. Boeckh supposes the lower and upper inscription to belong to the same age, and even to be the work of the same stonecutter: "Probabile mihi hoc unum videtur, post incisam inferiorem inscriptionem additam superiorem esse, ne nimium inconcinna lapidis videretur adornatio." Boeckh classes even this inscription among those "quæ falsam antiquitatis speciem præ se ferunt," like the columns of Herodes Atticus; and he assigns as a reason of the difference of dialects in the upper and lower inscription, a childish anxiety "ne novus hic titulus suis careret dotibus." Lastly, he supposes Phanodicus, the author of the inscription, to be the writer of the Deliacæ mentioned Schol. Apollon. Rhod. i. 211. 419. Diog. L. i. 31. 82. 83. who lived about the time of Aristotle. This Phanodicus of Proconnesus, being an Ionian, might have written the upper inscription in the Ionian dialect, in order to render it intelligible to his countrymen; and the lower, in the Attic dialect, was designed for the inhabitants of Sigeum. Thus Boeckh makes another shift, as if he were not pleased himself with his first hypothesis about the different dialects in the upper and lower part of the stone. We confess his arguments have failed to convince us, and we believe the lower inscription to be of a more ancient date than the upper, whence in the latter the Ionian letters are used.

Inscription 11. was brought by Sir W. Gell from Olympia, and was first published by R. Payne Knight. Boeckh shows by a passage from Strabo viii. that the Eleans and Arcadians spoke the Æolic dialect (*Ἰολιστὶ διαλέχθησαν*); and this inscription being written in that dialect, there is no reason to infer from the Doric treaties, given by Thucyd. v. 77. and 79. that the inscription must be on that account merely of a much higher date than Olymp. 90. Boeckh, however, on historical

grounds, supposes the treaty between the Eleans and the Hermæans, which this inscription contains, to have taken place about Olymp. 50.

Inscription 12. is an excellent specimen of the conjectural ingenuity of the editor. It is taken from the papers of Fourmont, and less liable to suspicion, as Boeckh observes, because it bears such evidences of mistakes, or of neglect in making the transcript, as would have been avoided by an artful compiler of inscriptions. As corrected by Boeckh the inscription reads thus:—

Ἐν μέσῳ γε Θέλης τε καὶ ἄστεος, ἄνερ, ὃδ' Ἑρμῆς.

It appears from a passage of a dialogue *De lucri cupidine* (cf. *Ælian. V. H. viii. 2.*), that Hipparchus had Hermes placed half-way between Athens and the several *Δῆμοι*, one on each side; on the right was written a pentameter, and on the left a hexameter: so that the two verses of both Hermes formed a distichon; the hexameter generally indicating to the traveller that he had arrived *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τοῦ δήμου*, and the pentameter containing some moral sentence; as,

Μνημα τὸδ' Ἰππάρχου, στείχε δίκαια φρονῶν.

According to O. Müller, the altar of the twelve gods at Athens served (as at Rome the *Miliarium Aureum*) to calculate distances from. We, however, remember an inscription in possession of Fauvel, which stated the distance of Athens from the Piræus at forty stadia; and, according to measurement, this is exactly the distance between the Acropolis and the Piræus. According to Fauvel, we believe the stone had been found walled in near the entrance of the Acropolis. However this may be, Boeckh's restoration of the above inscription appears to us most able and satisfactory.

Inscription 24. From the fragment of a column found in the Morea, and brought in 1783 to Ancona, where a stone-mason bought it, and left it exposed to the weather, where it was greatly injured by mud and the sea air, Boeckh reads thus:

Ἄρτεμι, σοὶ τὸδ' ἄγαλμ' ἱερῷσ' ᾠδίσιν [ἁμοιβήν]

Ἀσφαλῶ μήτηρ Φέρσις [Ἑρ]ῶ θυγάτηρ

Τῷ Παρίῳ ποίημα Κ[ώλω]τεω οὐ ν[ύ]ας φεύγων.

This was an *ex voto* to Diana Ilythia. The name of the mother Φέρσις i. q. *Θέρσις*, as φῆς θῆς, φλᾶν, θλᾶν, and ποίημα i. q. *ἔργον*. The artist was an exile from Paros, by name Colotes, as Boeckh conjectures; for Paus. v. 20. and Plin. xxxiv. 19. 27. mention an artist of this name, who, according to Pausanias, was a pupil of Praxiteles, a contemporary of Phidias, and in

faciendo Jove Olympio adjutor, (Plin. xxv. 34.) although not his pupil, as Pliny erroneously states. Heyne, however, (Opusc. T. v. p. 390.) supposes, that there have been two artists of the name of Colotes.

Inscriptions 25, 26, 27, are of a comparatively recent date with the affected appearance of antiquity. Such inscriptions became fashionable, when Greece had become an appendage to the Roman empire, when nothing was left but the recollections of past times and vanished glory. An antiquated orthography became then a substitute, a paltry one no doubt, for ancient freedom. Pausanias, however, mentions instances of this sort of affectation from a very early period: *Γέγραπται ἐπὶ τῷ τοιχῷ γράμμασιν Ἀττικοῖς ἔργα εἶναι Πραξιτέλους*, says Paus. i. 2, 4. in speaking of the works of Praxiteles in the temple of Ceres at Athens; and these *γράμματα Ἀττικά* were those used before the times of the archons Euclides, Olymp. 94. 2. Now Praxiteles lived about Olymp. 104. when those *γράμματα ἀρχαῖα*, as he calls them, v. 22, 2. had come out of use. These inscriptions of fictitious antiquity avoid of course the long vowels and double consonants, and assume the spiritus *h*. Thus the inscription found at Delphi contains the words, *εχς Ερχομ* instead of *ἐξ Ὁρχομ[enoῦ]*: and in those of Herodes, found on the Via Appia near the monument of Metella, we read not only, *ΕΝ ΤΕΙ ΗΟΔΟΙ Ρ. ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*, but even the spiritus intermedius, *as, MARTVS DAIMON ENHODIA Ρ. Μάρτυς δαίμων ἐνὸδία*.

This Herodes Atticus was born at Marathon in the reign of Hadrian. He was a man of great wealth and cultivated taste; and Philostratus, Vit. Soph. ii. 1, 14. says of him, *προσέκειτο πᾶσι τοῖς παλαιοῖς*. He built a magnificent odeon and a stadium at Athens, and another at Patræ, and a noble mansion for himself at Marathon. Under M. Anton. Pius he became consul at Rome; and built, after the death of his wife Annia Regilla, a triopium on the Via Appia, where Ceres was especially worshipped, besides Minerva and Nemesis. Boeckh refers to Paus. ii. 22, 2. who informs us, that a temple of Ceres at Argos had its name from Pelasgus, a son of Triopas: at Cnidos, a promontory of Caria, there was another triopium, built by Triopas; and the triopium of Herodes was probably, in imitation of that of Cnidos, devoted to the infernal gods (*θεοὶ χθόνιοι*), since we know that Herodes was instructed by Theagenes of Cnidos in the critical reading of the ancient writers. We may add, perhaps the Carian triopium was chosen by Herodes as a model in preference to the Eleusinian rites, just because many religious notions of the Greeks appear

to be derived from Caria, so that it was recommended by higher antiquity.

From inscription 27, it appears that Alciphron erected or renovated a stadium at Eleusis about the time of Hadrian.

Inscription 34 is taken from a marble anaglyph in the possession of the Earl of Pembroke, and published by Bimard la Bastie and Muratori, *Thes. T. i. p. 35—48*. It is written βουστροφῆδον, and runs thus: *Μανθεος: Αιδου: ευχαριστει: Δι: επι νικει πενταθλου: παιδος*. Maffei did not believe this inscription to be genuine: during his stay in England he had endeavored in vain to get a sight of the marble, which confirmed his suspicion. But the marble does exist, and has been seen by C. O. Muller, who also copies the inscription. Boeckh defends the inscription against Maffei; although he must allow that, even if genuine, it belongs to the number of those inscriptions to which inscriptions 5, 26, 27, belong. Maffei undoubtedly was wrong in maintaining that some letters of this inscription could not be found in any alphabet. The diphthong in *Αιδου* is a more decisive proof against its antiquity, since the Athenians did not write *ου* for *ο* before Olympiad 100. The Ionian characters were already for some time in use before the diphthong was adopted, nor did the Lacedæmonians use it at the time of Euclides. From a Macedonian silver coin it appears that it was used in Macedonia much earlier; for *Αλεξανδρου* is to be found on a coin, which represents Alexander the son of Amyntas, a contemporary of Pindar. The interpunction is another point against the high age of the inscription; it throws it into the times of the grammarians. The names *Μανθεος* and *Αιδος* no where occur; but nobody will say that we know all the Greek names. The word *ευχαριστει* for *ανέθηκε*, or *ανέθηκε χαριστήριον*, is not found in any other inscription; but Boeckh thinks that *ευχαριστειν* could be used for *gratias referre*, *gratificari*, *donare*: *παῖς πεντάθλος* means *puer quinquertio*, or a youth who fights in the *πένταθλον*. This *πένταθλον* cannot have taken place at Olympia, because no boys were admitted there except Olymp. 38. (Paus. v. 9. vi. 15.); but there were many other torialia in Greece. Hermann, however, shows that *πένταθλοι παῖδες* were first admitted at Nemea, Olymp. 53. Mantheus cannot have won the prize before Olymp. 80, 2, if ever he did win it.

Another Wilton inscription on a round Bacchic altar contains these words: *Μέλπομεν: Διόνυσον ἀγλαόμορπον Βακχεύτορα ξανθοκάρηνον*. The inscription seems, according to Boeckh, "ex Bacchico hymno fraude conficta." For in Jacob's Antho-

logy, ed. 2. T. ii. p. 185. is found a hymnus containing the following verses :

Μέλωμεν βασιλῆα φιλεῦϊον, εἰραφιῶτην
 ἄβροκόμεν, ἀγροΐκον, αἰδιμον, ἀγλαόμορφον
 Βοιωτὸν, Βερέμιον, βακχεύτορα, βοτρυχαίτην
 Διογενῇ δίγονον διδυραμβογενῇ Διόγυσον
 Ξυστοβάλον ξυνὸν ξενοδάτην ξανθοκάκηνον.

Both these inscriptions have been put also by Rose among the inscript. dubiæ.

Inscription 43 has been published by Demetrius Petrizzopulo : Saggio storico sulle prime età dell' Isola di Leucadia nell' Ionio, Florent. 1814. and is declared by Boeckh to be an impudent fabrication ; of which there cannot be the least doubt, although Rose complains only that it has been so badly copied.

After the inscription of Petrizzopulo follows the Appendix *Partis primæ*, or the *Inscriptiones Fourmonti Spuriæ*. Boeckh calls him "hominem vanitatis ventosissimæ," and "mendacissimum," and we shall therefore not detain our readers with any remarks on his inscriptions. Except Raoul Rochette, there is no man of sense in Europe who does not form the same opinion of Fourmont. We cannot conceive how it is possible to undertake the defence of an impostor, who dared to fabricate inscriptions of a date anterior to the Trojan war.

Short and Familiar NOTES on the PERSÆ of ÆSCHYLUS: originally written for the Use of a Young Pupil.

1. *Τᾶδε*. "Οἷς and its cases are used in the tragic writers, to show that the person or thing to which they are applied is either present on the stage or in sight ; and *τᾶδε καλεῖται* is the same as "we here are called." The chorus spoke by a *κορυφαῖος*, or head : therefore *κορυφαῖος*, here pointing to his companions, says, "this our party," &c.

Οἰχομένων. There are several verbs which have the form but not the signification of the present tense.

οἶχομαι is abii, I am gone ; not abeo, I am going.

ἔχω is veni, I am come venio, coming.

εἶμι is ibo, I will go. eo, going.

2. *Καλεῖται* is used where we should expect *ἵσται* ; which is a very common usage of *καλέομαι* in the tragic writers : infr. v.

247. οὔτινος δοῦλοι πέκληνται φασὶς σὺδ' ὑπήκοοι. See Dr. Monk, Alc. 2.

4. Φύλακες agrees with the idea of ἡμεῖς contained in τάδε πίστα καλεῖται.

If the last syllable of *προσβίαν* be short, read *τούς*; if it be long, read either *τούς* or *οὓς*: *τούς* is used for *οὓς*, or the article for the relative, in both choral and iambic metres.

5. Whom *Prince Xerxes* the king. If there be any distinction between *ἀναξ* and *βασιλεύς*, it may be that *ἀναξ* is a title of respect, *βασιλεύς* of authority.

7. Ἐφορεύειν. Herodotus informs us that Xerxes committed the government to his uncle Artabanus alone. *Χώρας* may not mean the whole country over which Xerxes ruled, but the land immediately around the palace, Ἰδριον.

13. Βαῦζω, to bark as a dog; whence the English word *bay*: as when a dog is said to *bay* the moon, i. e. to howl at it. The scholiast makes Asia the nom. case to *βαῦζει*: it may be thus taken; "the whole force of Asia is gone, and barks after the young man (Xerxes);" or it may be, "the whole force of Asia is gone, and still anxiously calls out for any fresh or additional man to join them."

16. Σούσαν governed of *ἑκας*: Susa the capital of Persia, Ecbatana of Media; and these two cities were the summer and winter residences of the kings of Persia. The ancient name of Ecbatana was *Accasæa*.

21. Ἀμίστρης. Herod. says, lib. i. that all the Persian names ended in σ. This is doubted by Scaliger.

24. Βασιλέως μεγάλου: the general title of the king of Persia.

37. Ὀγυγίας, Ogygian. Ogyges was a very ancient king of Athens; and when any thing was very old, it was called after his name. See Steph. ad Sept. c. Theb. 327.

51. Λόγχης ἀκμονες. The anvils of the lance; i. e. they support the blows of the lance with the same firmness that an anvil supports the blows of the hammer. Callim. in Hymn. Dian. calls Hercules *Τιρυσθὸς ἀκμων*.

62. Θρέψασα, from *τρέφω*; which shows that the original word from which *θρέψασα* is derived must have been *θρέφω*; but a Greek ear could not bear, except in extreme cases, the succession of two syllables in the same word, each beginning with an aspirate:

therefore instead of <i>θρέφω</i> they said	<i>τρέφω</i> ,	fut. <i>θρέψω</i> .
<i>ἔχω</i> ,	<i>ἔχω</i> ,	<i>ἔξω</i> .
<i>θύφα</i> ,	<i>τυφα</i> ,	<i>θύψω</i> .
<i>θάφω</i> ,	<i>τάφω</i> ,	<i>θάψω</i> .
<i>θριχὸς</i> ,	<i>τριχὸς</i> ,	from <i>θρίξ</i> .

The 1st. aorist pass. of *τρέφω*, according to this rule, would be *ἐτρέφθην*; but they said *ἐθρέφθην*, to distinguish it from the 1st aor. pass. of *τρέπω*, preferring harshness of sound to ambiguity of expression.

65. *Περάω*, transire facio; but in the preterperf. tense many verbs lay down their active meaning and become neuters, though *περάω* does signify sometimes transeo.

68. *Σχεδιά*, derived from *ἔχω*, contineo, and signifies a raft which will hold together and support you on the water.

70. *Ὀδισμα*. Ennius says,

Pontibus instratis conjunxit littora Xerxes.

Juvenal asserts that this story is false, Sat. x. 173.

creditur olim,

Velificatus Athos et quicquid Græcia mendax

Audet in historia, cum stratum classibus iisdem

Suppositumque rotis solidum mare.

Πολύγομφον ὄδισμα, refers to a *road* which he made across the Hellespont by a bridge of boats; which bridge encompassed the surface of the sea as a yoke encircles the neck of an animal.

76. *Θεῖον*, divinum, inde immensum; for the Greeks called any thing *θεῖος* which was large in size or excellent in kind: so *θεῖος ᾠοῖδης*, the divine or excellent minstrel in Homer.

79. Relying on his firm vigorous generals; i. e. relying on the firmness of his vigorous generals.

83. Looking with his eyes the azure gaze; i. e. putting on the look: *δέσγμα* is the accusative case of a cognate object governed of *λείσσω*. So in Sept. c. Theb. v. 53.

λείοντων ὡς Ἄρην δεδορότων:

like lions looking war; i. e. carrying war in their looks.

Δράκων, derived from *δέρχομαι*, from the keenness of its gaze.

87. *Ἐπάγω* is a term borrowed from hunting, and signifies to direct or urge on a dog to the pursuit of the game.

88. *Τοξόδαμνον ἄρην*, war which subdues by the bow: the penult of *Ἄρης* is here long, so it is in Homer,

Ἄρες Ἄρες, βροτολοιγὲ, μαιῖφονε, τειχεσίπλητε.

89. *Ἵπποστας, εἶργειν*: translate as if these were two verbs, to withstand and check.

Εἶργειν is distinguished from *εἶργειν*: according to some grammarians, *εἶργω*, excludo; *εἶργω*, includo.

92. *Κῦμα θαλάσσης*, the Persian army which was advancing like a wave from the sea: in Sept. c. Theb. we have

βοᾷ γὰρ κῦμα χειρσαῖον στρατοῦ:

and ibid.

κῦμα γὰρ περὶ πτόλιν

δοχμολόφων ἀνδρῶν

καχλάζει πνοαῖς ἄρεος ὀρόμενον.

95. *Τίς ὁ κραίην*; Cf. Soph. CE. R. v. 874. speaking of ὕβρις.

102. *Ἀρκύστατα* signifies the places where nets were placed.

115. *Ἐσορᾶν*, to bear the sight : so Hor.

Qui vidit mare turgidum,

who bore the sight of the swollen sea.

119. *Μοι φρήν*, where we should expect *μου φρήν* : this mode of speaking is very common both in Greek and Latin ; indeed *μου φρήν* is very uncommon.

Hor.

Illi robur et æs triplex

Circa pectus erat.

Hom. Il. N. 21. *Ἐνθα δέ οἱ κλυτὰ δώματα βένθεσι λίμνης*

Χρύσεα μαρμαίροντα τετεύχεται.

Cf. also Il. K. 438.

121. *Στρατεύματος* governed of *ἔνεκα*. The genitive case in this sense follows exclamations, where something like this is implied, alas ! alas ! and the genitive gives the cause of the exclamation.

124. *Πόλις* and *ἄστυ* differ : *πόλις* signifies the city and inhabitants, or sometimes the state or government of the city ; *ἄστυ*, the city or buildings. *Πόλις* civitas, and *ἄστυ* urbs.

125. There must be a colon after *πολισμ'*, as Dr. Blomfield has edited ; and from *ἀντίδουπον* to *ἀπίων* must be parenthetical, otherwise there is no verb with which the subj. *πέση* can be connected : by this arrangement the passage runs thus : "lest the state should hear of the great city of Susa and the town of Cissia being robbed of its men, and (lest) rendings should fall on their linen garments."

130. It was a custom all over the East to rend their garments in token of affliction.

144. *Μονόζυξ*, more elegant than *μόνη*. It signifies that she was one of a pair yoked together in matrimony, and deprived of her yoke-fellow.

148. *πῶς πράσσει*, distinguished from *πῶς ποιεῖ* : the former means, how fares he, or what is his success ? the latter, how is he acting ? or what have been his performances ?

157. *Προσπινῶ*. It was the custom of the Persians to fall prostrate at the feet of their sovereign before they addressed them. Or. 1509.

προσκυνᾷ σ' ἄναξ, νόμοισι βαρβάροισι προσπεσών.

162. *Ἐφυν* and its different persons are frequently used in the sense of the present tense. So Horace uses *erat* :—

Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero

Pulsanda tellus, nunc Saliaribus

Ornare pulvinar Deorum

Tempus erat dapibus, sodales.

165. *Εὐναστήριον* : *εὐνή*, a bed ; *εὐναστής*, the person who sleeps in that bed ; and *εὐναστήριον*, the place where the *εὐναστής* sleeps, or a bed-chamber. So *δεσμός*, a fetter ; *δεσμωτής*, a person fettered, or a prisoner ; *δεσμωτήριον*, the place where the *δεσμωτής* is kept, a prison : *φύλαξ*, a guard ; *φυλακτήριον*, the place where the *φύλακες* remain, a garrison. Cf. Cattieri, *Gaz. Græ.* p. 17.

166. *Καρδίαν*, acc. governed of *ἀμύσσει*, not of *κατὰ* understood. Porson says that if a verb can govern each of two acc. cases separately, it may govern them conjointly. See *Phœn.* 300. So *Trach.* 49.

πολλὰ μὲν σ' ἔγωγε
κατεῖδον ἤδη πανδάκρυτ' ὀδύρματα
τὴν Ἡράκλειον ἔξοδον γοομένην.

So *Æsch. Theb.* 834. *Κακὸν με καρδίαν τι περιπίπτει κρύος.*

Eumen. 88. *Μὴ φόβος σε νικάτω φρένας.*

168. *Κονίσας*, "having raised the dust of the ground with its foot [in flight] should upset," *Blomf.* ; or perhaps it might mean, wealth, after having covered the ground with money as with dust.

175. *Ἡρὸς τὰς* and *πρὸς ταῦτα*, *propterea*, and may be translated *wherefore*, or *and now* in the sense of the passage in *Shakespeare*, "*and now to supper with what appetite ye may.*" *Ἡρὸς τοῖσδε*, a different thing, means in addition to these, "besides."

179. *Ἡγείσθαι θέλη* : the reading of this passage is manifestly corrupt. *Dr. Blomfield* suggests *ἄνπερ δύναμις, ἡγείσθαι σε δεῖ* : and it would be translated, "of whatever things we have the power or control, it is your part to lead the way ;" another reading is *ἡγείσθαι θ' ἔλγς*, and then we must translate, "whatever we can do, and what you may choose to propose."

182. *Γῆν οἴχεται*. Verbs of motion take an acc. of the place to which, without a prep. Cf. *Alc.* 495.

190. *Κατεργήτα* : why sisters of the same family ? *Andro of Halicarnassus* informs us that *Oceanus* married *Pompholygè* and *Parthenopè* ; by the latter he had two daughters, *Europa* and *Thracè* ; and by the former, *Asia* and *Libya*, from whom the continents derived their names. *Schol.*

192. *Βάρβαρον*, foreign ; the term was proper in the mouth of *Æsch.*, improper in that of *Atossa* : the cause of this slight impropriety is very obvious, when we consider that the writer

was a Greek, writing for Greeks who called all except those of their own nation *βάρβαροι*.

210. *Ἐσχάραν Φοίβου* : this mention of sacrifices and gods is contrary to the religious sentiments and customs of the Persians, who erected neither statues nor temples nor altars to their deities. Herodotus says, *οὔτε βωμοὺς ποιεῦνται, οὔτε πῦρ ἀνακαίουσι μέλλοντες θύειν*.

213. *Ἐφορμαίνοντα*, rushing or pouncing upon.

214. *Οὐδέν*. The acc. case after some word *ἔποιησε* understood : it would not be proper or scarcely sense to connect *οὐδέν* with *παρεῖχε*. These instances often occur where a verb is proper as applied to the noun immediately next to it, improper when applied to a noun more remote. So *Prom. v. 21*.

Ἴν' οὔτε φώνην οὔτε τοῦ μορφήν βροτῶν ὄψει.

228. *Τάμπαλιν*, the contrary. So in *Hec. 777*.

243. *Ἀργύρου πύγη*, refers to the silver mines possessed by the Athenians at Laurium and Thoricum.

252. *Δρόμημα φάτος Περσικόν*, where we should expect *δρόμημα φάτος Περσικοῦ*. Horace imitates this figure :—

Premant Calena falce quibus dedit

Fortuna vitem :

for *Calenam falce vitem*.

256. *Ἐν* often denotes the cause, manner, or instrument. So *Œ. R. sub init.* *ἐν γηρεῖ βαρεῖς*, laden or weighed down with old age.

This line is an instance of the quasi cæsura, without an elision. These lines generally occur where there is great agitation in the speaker, though this is denied by Dr. Blomfield ; it is, however, certain that many similar lines are found under such circumstances, as *Œ. R. l. 728*.

ὦ Ζεῦ, τί μιν δρᾶσαι βεβούλευσαι πέρι ;

266. *Νόστιμον φάος*, in the Homeric sense of *νόστιμον ἡμῶν*, the day of return : “ I am returned unexpectedly ; I behold the light.” So *δούλιον ἡμῶν*, the day of slavery.

295. *Σιγῶ πάλαι* : *πάλαι* is used with a present tense to signify what has been previously, and continues to the present time ; I have been long silent, and am silent up to the present moment. So *Aj. Fl. 3*.

καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ σκήναις σε ναυτικάς ὄρω

πάλαι κυνηγετοῦντα καὶ μετρούμενον

ἔχνη.

dogging him now, and having been doing so for a long time.

Jamdudum is used in the same sense in Latin. Cf. Hor. Od. iii. 29. 1.

Tyrrhena regum progenies, tibi
Non ante verso lene merum cado,
Cum flore, Mæcenas, rosarum, et
Pressa tuis balanus capillis

Jamdudum apud me est :

is with me, and has been so for a long time.

296. Ἵππερβάλλει is not taken *absolutely* or intransitively, but transitively; having the succeeding line as the acc. case after it: negatio propter sententiam negantem ornat magis quam negat. Pauw.

307. Ἀρεμβάρης. The penult of this word is here short, though it is long in v. 29. This licence of quantity seems allowed in other Persian names, as Ἀριόμαρδος: the first syllable is long v. 38. and short v. 326.

Ἴππου: when ἵππος designates a body of cavalry as here, it is always used in the feminine gender.

308. Στυφλός is of the masc. and fem. gender; and several adjectives in *ος* have the fem. both in *η* and *ος*; as στεφρὸς, κλυτός, ἀργός, γενναίος, &c. Cf. Hec. 296.

310. Πήδημα, the acc. case of a cognate object, governed of ἀφήλατο.

315. Κύρισσον must be written κύρισσον, because the Attic tragic writers *never* omitted the augment in iambic metre: they did sometimes in the choral odes, because they were written in the Doric dialect, which did not always employ the augment. Hence the reading of v. 313. ναὸς ἐκ βαιᾶς (or μιᾶς) πέσον, is objectionable, and v. 1. should be ναὸς ἔπεσον ἐκ μιᾶς, as Porson suggested.

321. Πυρσὴν not πυρρὰν: the tragic writers used *ρσ* and not *ρρ*: thus they said Χερσονησίαν, not Χερρόνησίαν, Hec. 8. nor did they use *ττ* but *σσ*: they said μέλισσα, not μέλιττα. See R. P.

319. Σκληρᾶς . . . the sojourner in a *cruel* land; namely, Salamis.

321. Ἀριόμαρδος: "there must be anhiatus after this, for two reasons; 1st. because Ariomardus came from Thebes in Egypt, and could not by his death cause any great sorrow to the people of Sardis; 2nd. because it offends against the metre, since a cretic at the end of a line cannot be preceded by a long syllable at the conclusion of an hypermonosyllabic word." R. P. Præf. p. 38.

348. Ὦν, Attice for ᾶς, by attraction to νηῶν understood after πλῆθος.

349. Ἐχω, when joined with an adverb, as here, must be translated by the auxiliary verb, to be.

353. Θεοὶ . . . the following line must be attributed to Atossa, and read ἔτ' ἄρ' Ἀθηνῶν, and the meaning will run thus : [I know that] the gods look after or endeavor to preserve the city of Athens. Is that city still impregnable ? . . . the messenger answers, Yes ; for whilst its inhabitants are in existence, its chief bulwark is secure, independent of its walls : it was a matter of boast in a country that it was ἀπόρρητος. So Eurip. Med. 822, congratulates the Athenians because they inhabited ἱερὰν χώραν ἀπόρρητον.

Σώζω is to endeavor to preserve, ἐκσώζω to succeed in preserving : the same distinction holds between φεύγω and ἐκφεύγω, though we find infr. 375. φευξοίεθ' in the sense of ἐκφεύξοιθε. The fact is, words may have the sense of their compounds with ἐκ, but the compounds cannot have the simple meaning of the verbs from which they are derived.

368. Φθόνον. The ancients used to attribute all dangerous reverses of fortune to the envy of the gods : thus in Alc. 1154. Hercules prays Φθόνος δὲ μὴ γένοιτό τις θεῶν. Cf. Herod. iii. 40. the letter of Amasis to Polycrates . . . ἐπισταμένῳ τὸ θεῖον ὡς ἐστὶ φθονερὸν, κ. τ. λ.

370. Φλέγων not φλέγειν. Verbs of beginning and ceasing, with many verbs of sense, take after them a participle, and not the infinitive mood. Φλέγω is here used actively, to signify uro, or to enlighten. So Theb. 509. Διὰ κερὸς βέλος φλέγων, waving his spear in his hand so as to cause a bright light. Cæ. R. 191.

ὃς νῦν ἄχαλκος ἀσπίδων
φλέγει με περιβάτος ἀντιάζων.

377. Κρατὸς means capitis, and we may know this for two reasons ; its penult is long, that of κράτος, robur, short ; κρατὸς, capitis, is oxyton ; κράτος, robur, is paroxyton ; κρατὸς capitis,

κράτος robur. κρατὸς has no nom. there are κρατὸς, κρατὶ, κράτα, and κρατας : the gen. and dat. are fem., the acc. is masc. and neuter. See Schol. in Hec. 432.

417. Δόρυ, in the Latin sense of trabs, a vessel : as Hor. Od. 1. 1.

ut trabe Cypria

Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare.

459. Εἰναλίῳν is not admissible on account of the metre ; for in that case there would be an anapæst in the fifth foot : now an anapæst can only stand in the first foot, except in the case of a proper name, and then must be contained in the proper name.

464. *Φράξαντες*: here *φραζάμενοι* would be proper, because they protected *their own* persons. But *φράξαντες* is true as far as it goes. The active voice is used where you might expect the middle; but not *vice versa* in words that have both active and middle in use: thus, *έλουσα δέμας* may mean, I washed my body; but *έλουσάμην δέμας* cannot mean, I washed the body of another. So *infr.* 483. *έπέσπασε*.

515. *Θρήκην*, κ. τ. λ. This line has no *cæsura* or quasi *cæsura*. Person says, pronuntiandi difficultas laborem ab exercitu Persico exhaustum optime exprimit. See above v. 256.

522. *Ενήλου*. So *CE. R.* v. 263.

νῦν δ' εἰς τὸ κείνου κραθ' ἐνήλαθ' ἡ τύχη.

527. *Διαπεπραγμένον*, perfecti, or completely destroyed; so *ἐξεργασμένοις*, completely done for, or undone.

531. *Ἐπίσταμαι μὲν [ἤξειν λαβοῦσαν πέλανον] ὡς ἐπ' ἐξεργασμένης. ἀλλ' [ἤξω λαβοῦσα, κ. τ. λ.] ἐς τὸ λοιπὸν, &c.* τὸ λοιπὸν may mean (1) the remainder of the army, or (2) the future.

— *Δυσρήματα*, a plural put in apposition with a noun sing., a very common idiom in the tragic writers. So *Hipp.* 11.

Ἰππόλυτος ἀγνοῦ Πιπθέως παιδεύματα. See Dr. Monk in loco.

560: *Τί πότε*, for what possible end did Darius then preside, a no uninjurious governor of his people? in other words, What good has resulted from the calamitous reign of Darius, if his son Xerxes will not take a lesson from his misfortunes?

— *Πότε* is used in interrogative sentences to express vehement impatience in the speaker. So *Hec.* 182. *τί ποτ' ἀπύσω*; what possible thing shall I say? and v. 85.

571. *Αὐτὸν ὡς ἀκούομεν*: the Schol. asserts that *ὡς* here is redundant; if *ὡς ἀκούομεν* be taken parenthetically, or preceded and succeeded by commas, as Dr. Blomfield has edited, "as we hear," we must understand *λέγουσι*, or tale quid. Heath says that *ὡς* is put for *οὕτως*, with very little meaning.

576. After *Κυχρίδας*, *ὡὰ*, Hermann replaces *ἔρρανται*, from v. 585. for in this strophe a word of three long syllables is wanting, and in the antistrophe it is redundant; but perhaps it might be read *ἔρρονται*. Dr. Blomfield suggests *ἔρροντες*.

593. *Ἀρξονται*, the fut. middle used passively. Dr. Monk maintains that there are four forms of the future passive: (1) what is called the first future middle; (2) the first fut. pass. (3) the second fut. pass. and (4) the paulo post fut.

604. *Ἐμπορος*, would mean a merchant in, or a dealer in evils — one who deals in evils; *ἔμπειρος* means, experienced in . . . *ἔμπορος* is perhaps the reading, as it agrees with the metaphor contained in the whole passage.

620. Ἀγπίας, its mother, viz. the vine called ἀγπίας, either because it caused wildness in those that drank it to excess; or because it was planted in the fields, and this pure liquid the pride of the ancient vine [derived] from its wild parent.

630. If it be read θαλάμους ὑπὸ, πρὸς must be understood before θαλάμους; but if ὑπὸ be παροxyt. it may govern θαλάμους.

639. Μακαρίτης is applied to a person when dead; μακάριος, to a person when living, or generally. See Schol. in loc.

645. Αἰνέω, signifies to assent to, or acquiesce in, and acquiesce in him coming; i. e. permit him to come. Cf. Alc. 2.

ἐν οἷς ἔτλην ἐγὼ

θῆσαν τράπεζαν αἰνέσαι, θεὸς περ αὖν.

to acquiesce in a servile table. See Dr. Monk in l.

668. Ἐποδάκει Brunck supposes to be put Ionicè for ἐφοδάκει; but no such word occurs as ἐφοδακίω; the scholiast has conceived the existence of some word ποδακίω, the meaning of which is, to direct under his feet, as a charioteer directs his horses. Dr. Blomfield proposes στράτῳ ἐοδάσσει, he guided well his army.

673. Κατὰ πᾶσ' : κατὰ in this case must be joined with ἀπόλαυσι, and would cause it to signify the complete way in which the youth were destroyed. Κατὰ γὰρ is another reading, and adopted by Dr. Blomfield, and would mean, that they were destroyed and buried.

687. Πιστὰ for πιστοὶ : so in the beginning of the play, τάδε πιστὰ, for οἱ πιστοί.

693. Ψυχαγωγοῖς, with lamentations of sufficient power to raise or bring the souls from the shades below.

694. Εὐέξοδον. Virg. Æn. vi.

Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad auras,
Hic labor, hoc opus est.

Catullus:

Illuc unde negant redire quonquam.

712. Τοι in gnomis amant tragici. R. P.

719. Γὰρ refers to something which is elegantly understood : γὰρ contains the reason of something like this, The chorus are prevented by their feelings from telling you; but I will, for, &c.

720. Εἰπεῖν ἔπος, to speak or say one word—to speak in a word—to speak briefly. So Eurip. Or. 1.

Οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν δεινόν, ᾧ εἰπεῖν ἔπος.

730. Τίς δαιμόνων. This refers to the opinion entertained by the ancients—quos Jupiter vult perdere, prius dementat; which

140 Notes on the *Persæ* of *Æschylus*.

is a translation of the following lines in Euripides, found in the *Incertæ Tragœdiæ* as edited by Barnes:

ὅταν δὲ δαίμων ἀνδρὶ πορσύνῃ κακὰ,
τὸν νοῦν ἔβλαψεν πρῶτον.

So Velleius Paterculus de Variana clade, ii. cap. 118. Ita se res habet, ut plerumque Deus, fortunam mutaturus, consilia corrumpat.

752. *ῥέοντα* may be taken actively, and signify, rolling or urging on the Bosphorus; *ῥέω* is sometimes so used. Hec. 528.

Ἐρρῆς χειρὶ. . . *χοῶς* θανόντι πατρί—poured on his hand libations to his father. If there was authority for it, Dr. Blomfield's reading would be preferable:

ἔλπισε σχῆσειν, ῥέοντα Βοσπόρου ῥόον βοοῦ.

773. *Φρένες*, his name was *Ἀρταφρένης*, and rightly too, for . .

802. *Νοστήμου σωτηρίας*, the safety of return, where we should expect *νόστου σωτήρος*.

804. *Οὐ τὰ μὲν*: it is not that some misfortunes happen and others do not; but *all* the misfortunes which man is doomed to suffer he must meet with.

814. *Βρίτη*, from *βρέτας*, q. *βροτὸς*, because it was an image in the human shape; *ξύανον*, an image formed of wood or stone, but not necessarily of the human shape: such was the Palladium.

826. *Ἐκάρπωσε*. The past tense is often used in general remarks to denote frequency of occurrence. So Hor. Od. 111. ii. 29.

sæpe Diespiter

Neglectus incesto *addidit* integrum.

Raro antecedentem scelestum

Deseruit pede pœna claudo.

Cf. Philoct. v. 688.

Ἔβρις. Cf. *Œ. Rex*, 874.

ὕβρις, ἣν πόλλων ὑπερπλησθῇ μάταν,

ἀν μὴ *πίκαιρα* μηδὲ συμφέροντα,

*ἀκρότατα*ν εἰσαναβᾶσ' ἀπότομον

ἄρουσεν εἰς ἀνάγκαν

ἐνθ' οὐ ποδὶ *χρησίμῳ* χρῆται.

832. *Ζεύς* τοι . . Cf. Hor. lib. i. 34.

Valet ima summis

Mutare, et insignem attenuat Deus,

Obscura promens.

Senec. Thyest. Quem dies vidit veniens superbum,

Hunc dies vidit fugiens jacentem.

855. Ἐπαντιάζειν παῖδ' ἐμῷ. Dr. Blomfield alters ἐμῷ to ἐμὸν, and quotes a passage from Herod. to prove that Ἐπαντιάζειν may have an acc. case after it. This alteration is made because the tragic writers never elided the iota of the dat. sing. Dr. Monk, however, says this is not true in all cases, and would not alter the passage in question. Cf. Alc. 1137.

καὶ μὴν προτείνω, Γόργον ὡς καρατόμαρ.

BLOMFIELD'S CANONS.

SEPTEM CONTRA THEBAS.

1. Ἐπὶ, in the sense of contra, is sometimes used with a dative case by Æschylus. See Sept. Theb. 711. Agam. 60. P. V. 1124. though with the genitive more generally. V. 1.

2. The article is frequently used for the relative: τοὺς for οὓς Pers. 43. τοὔπερ for οὗπερ ibid. 780. τόθεν for ὅθεν ibid. 780. τὴν for ἣν Agam. 644, &c. V. 37.

3. The tragic writers used the Doric forms, κυναγὸς, κυναγέτω, κυναγέτης, λοχαγέτης, ἐβδομαγέτης. V. 42.

4. Brunck and Schutz prefer as more Attic πλεύμων instead of πνεύμων, but the latter is the more recent Attic form. The grammarians indeed side with Brunck, but then it is well known that they derived their rules for the most part from Ælian, Libanius, Aristides, and other sophists, sometimes from Lucian, more rarely from the historians or Plato, and very seldom indeed from the scenic poets. V. 61.

5. The Ionic νηδς for ναδς was not used in the iambic senary. V. 62.

6. Εὐχομαι is frequently omitted before an infinitive mood. See Sept. Theb. 239. Choëph. 304. Eurip. Suppl. 3. V. 75.

7. Τίω has the first syllable common in Homer, but short in Æschylus and Aristophanes. The first syllable of τίσω is always long. V. 77.

8. The first syllable of Ἄρης is sometimes long as in vv. 125. 336. 465.

9. Nouns compounded of nouns in ος generally retain the termination ος; thus words compounded of λόγος, τρόχος, &c. in the tragic writers never end in ας; that termination being more modern and less agreeable to analogy. V. 109.

10. Some adjectives have the three terminations, ειος, ιος, ικος, as ἵππειος, ἱππιος, ἱππικὸς; δούλειος, δούλιος, δουλικὸς, &c. The

first of which three forms is used only on account of the metre. V. 116.

11. The last syllable of *πόντια* is always short. V. 141.

12. The probable orthography of *χνόα* is *κνόα*. From *κνέω* is derived *κνούς* and *κνόα*, as from *ρέω*, *ρεῦς* and *ρόα*; from *χέω*, *χοῦς* and *χόα*. V. 142.

13. *Μή* sometimes forms a crasis with *εἰ* and *εἰς*. V. 193.

14. The tragic writers never join *δὲ* and *τε*. V. 212.

15. The words *Σύ τοι* are never construed except with the indicative. V. 220.

16. *Οὔτι* no where begins a sentence, unless *μή*, *ποῦ*, or *πᾶς* follows, or when there is an interrogation, and then a word is always interposed between them. The formula *ἀλλ' οὔτι* is frequent at the head of a sentence. V. 222.

17. *Νυν* is always an enclitic when it is subjoined to the particle *μή*. V. 228.

18. *Ἀπολέγω* is a word unheard of by the tragic writers. V. 259.

19. The Attics wrote *δήιος* and *δῆος*, not *δαίος* and *δαῖος*, as is clear from the compounds *δηιάλωτος*, *ἄδῆος*, and the verb *δηόω*. *Δάιος*, however, is the proper orthography, when it signifies *ἄθλιος*. V. 264.

20. *Νίας* is a monosyllable. V. 316.

21. *Ὡς*, in the sense of *adeo* ut, is only found with the infinitive. V. 361.

22. *ὑτέρκοπος*, not *ὑπέρκοπος*, is the form used by the tragic writers; for there is no passage in them where the metre requires the latter form; some where it rejects it. A later age, as it seems, inserted the *μ*. V. 387.

23. *Ἀνοια*, and similar compounds, very rarely produce the last syllable, in Æschylus never. V. 398.

24. *Ἄ μὴ κράνοι θεός*. In prayers of this kind the aorist is more usual than the present. V. 422.

25. *Ἰεὺς* in the tragic writers has the first syllable common, but oftener short. V. 489.

26. *Τω* is never put for *τούτῳ* with a substantive. V. 505.

27. *Εἴθε γὰρ* is scarcely Greek. Utinam is expressed by *εἰ* or *εἰ γὰρ*, never by *εἴθε γάρ*. V. 563.

28. *Πολέμαρχος*, not *Πολεμάρχας*. That the Attics terminated compounds of this kind by *χος* may be inferred from the circumstance that their proper names were *Ἰππαρχος*, *Νέαρχος*, *Κλίμαρχος*. V. 828.

29. In the Attic poets probably *μέλει* in the vocative is always a dissyllable. V. 945.

30. *Πρᾶγος* is a more tragic word than *πρᾶγμα*. Gl. 2.
31. Words compounded of *ρόθος* were favorites with Æschylus, as *κολύρροθος*, *ταχύρροθος*, *ἐπέρροθος*, *ἀλέρροθος*, *καλέρροθος*, &c. Gl. 7.
32. From *οἶμοι* is derived *οἰμῶζω*, as from *μῦ*, *μύζω*; from *αἶ*, *αἶζω*; [from *αἰ* *αἰ*, *αἰάζω*; from *οἰ* *οἰ*, *οἶζω*; from *ἐλελεῦ*, *ἐλελίζω*; from *ὀτοτοῖ*, *ὀτοτούζω*; from *αὖ*, *αὖω* and *αὐτέω*; from *φεῦ*, *φεύζω*; from *εὐοῖ*, *εὐάζω*]. *Οἰμωγή* is more frequently used than *οἰμωγμα*. Gl. 8.
33. When *Ἑλλείπω* signifies *deficio*, *absum*, it requires a genitive; when it signifies *omitto*, it is followed by an accusative. Gl. 10.
34. *Πύργωμα* is a *fortification*, or a collection of *πύργοι*: just as *χαίτωμα* and *τείχωμα* are a collection of *χαίται* and *τείχεις*. Gl. 30.
35. *Πανώλεθρος* has both an active and passive signification. Gl. 71.
36. The tragic writers use both *λαός* and its Attic form *λαῶς*. Gl. 80.
37. *Ἀμάχητος* is used but rarely for *ἄμαχος* and *ἀμάχητος*. Gl. 85.
38. *Λύκειος*, an epithet of Apollo, is derived from *λυκή*, *diluculum*, whence the Latin *lux*. Gl. 133.
39. From the obsolete verb *λήκω* are derived the perfect *λάλακα* and the 2nd aor. *ἔλακον*. Gl. 141.
40. *Βρίθω* sometimes, though rarely, has an active signification, "to load." It is more generally used intransitively, "to be heavy." Gl. 141.
41. The tragic writers frequently used nouns in *ας*, as *λιθάς*, a heap or shower of stones, *νιθάς*, a shower of snow, *φυλλάς*, a heap of leaves, &c. Gl. 146.
42. *Στέγω*, *sustineo*, *non admitto*; and is properly said of a ship which is *water-tight*. Gl. 202.
43. *Ἐκηλος* is formed from the obsolete verb *ἔκω*, *volo*: as from *σιγάω* or *σίγω*, *σιγηλός*; from *αἰσχύναω*, *αἰσχυνηλός*; from *ὕψι*, *ὕψηλός*; from *βεβαῶω*, *βεβηλός*. Gl. 224.
44. *Σαίνειν* is said of a dog who wags his tail and fawns: thence, to flatter. Gl. 379.
45. The penult of *άλύω* is short in Homer, and long in other Greek poets. In the *Odyssey*, I. 398. *άλύων* has the penult long, which would lead to the supposition that the passage where it occurs was not Homer's, though it is quoted by an old grammarian in Eustath. II. Z. p. 654, 55. Gl. 387.
46. The Greeks used *θανατηφόρος*, *λαμπαδηφόρος*, *ἀεσφατηλόρος*,

χθονιφόρος, and the like, instead of *θανατοφόρος*, &c. to avoid the concurrence of four short syllables. Gl. 415.

47. *Ἡ μὲν*, certe, is a formula of confirmation, used in case of an oath. Gl. 527.

48. Words ending in *ηστής* are very rare. Gl. 641.

49. *Στύγος*, odium, is frequently used by Æschylus, but very seldom by others. Gl. 650.

50. *Τρέω* is a Doric word, very seldom used by the tragic writers except in the aorist. Gl. 790.

51. Words compounded of *κότος* were favorites with Æschylus. Gl. 804.

52. *Ὀλολυγμός* is a female cry or shriek. Gl. 825.

53. *Ἀλαλάζω* strictly means, to raise the shout of triumph; sometimes simply *ejulo*. Gl. 951.

54. *Ἀδελφείος* no where occurs in the tragic writers except in the choral odes. Add. 537.

AGAMEMNON.

1. *Κλαίω*, *καίω*, &c. were the more ancient Attic forms; for which, subsequent to the time of Æschylus, *κλάω*, *κάω*, &c. were used. V. 17.

2. *Ἐάλωκα* and *ἤλωκα* are both found in the best Greek writers; the former is more ancient, the latter, more modern Attic. V. 29.

3. It is doubtful whether *χρῆμα* or *χρῖσμα* is the better form. From *χρίω* (the first syllable being always long) was deduced *χριστός*, as from *χράομαι*, *χρηστός*. But the substantive was *χρῆμα*; so from *χρίω*, *χρῖμα*; from *κονίω*, *κόνιμα*; from *μηνίω*, *μήνιμα*. V. 93.

4. Adjectives compounded of the dative *δορί*, or *δούρι*, retained the iota in composition, as *δορίκπητος*, *δουριάλατος*, *δορίληπτος*, *δουριπετής*, *δοριμανής*, *δορίθηρατος*, *δορίμαργος*. But those which are formed from the accusative retain the *υ*, as *δορυφόρος*, *δορυσσός*, *δορυξόος*, *δορύκρανος*. V. 115.

5. Diminutives of animals terminate in *ιδεύς*. V. 117.

6. *Τοιοῦτον* and *τοσοῦτον* are the Attic forms of the neuter gender: *τοιοῦτο* and *τοσοῦτο* the Ionic. V. 306.

7. The Attics said *διακονεῖν* rather than *διηκονεῖν*. V. 310.

8. *Εὖ σέβειν θεούς*, and *εὐσεβεῖν εἰς θεούς* differ: the former signifies, duly to worship the gods; the latter, to conduct oneself piously towards the gods: the latter cannot have an accusative after it except with a preposition. V. 329.

9. The Attics used *ἄλλοκομαι* in the present, and adopted the

other tenses from ἀλόω, whence also ἀναλόω. Wherefore the optative should be written ἀλώην, as βιῶην, δῶην, and the like. V. 331.

10. Ὅπως ἂν does not precede the optative, except in the sense of *quo maxime modo*. When ὅπως signifies *ut*, it requires the subjunctive with, or the optative without ἂν. V. 357.

11. Ἦτοι is not used by the tragic writers for *sane*, unless followed by ἄρα or ἂν. V. 462.

12. In solemn appeals, such as Hom. Il. E. 116.

Εἰ ποτέ μοι καὶ πατρὶ φίλα φρονέουσα παρίστης
Δηῖω ἐν πολέμῳ, νῦν αὖτ' ἔμει φίλαι, Ἀθήνη.

Εἴ ποτε is more frequently used than εἰ που. V. 503.

13. Δρόσοι κατεφέκαζον, ἔμπεδον σίνος
Ἑσθημάτων, τιθέντες ἐνθρονον τρίχα.

Here the young scholar will remark that the masculine participle τιθέντες agrees with the feminine noun δρόσοι; of which anomaly perhaps no other instance can be found in the Attic poets, except in the case of animals. V. 544.

14. Πῶς ἂν with the optative frequently signifies *utinam* in Euripides, much more rarely in the other tragic writers, perhaps never in Æschylus. V. 605.

15. Γὰρ is frequently used in interrogative sentences [and may be translated by, what?]. V. 613.

16. Διὰ, ἀπα, and ὑπα, occur in the Greek poets for the more common forms διὰ, ἀπὸ, and ὑπό. V. 865.

17. Θυραῖος is said of a person even in the feminine gender: θυραία of a thing in the same gender. V. 1022.

18. The penult of πληθύνω is short; of πληθύνω, long. V. 1341.

19. The primary meaning of δίκη was probably *likeness, similitude*: whence δίκηλον, *an image*; and δίκην, for κατὰ δίκην, *instar*, like. Gl. 3.

20. Βοῦς ἐπὶ γλώσση is a well-known proverb, and said of those who being bribed do not mention those things which they ought to disclose, and then applied to others who through fear or dread of punishment dare not speak out freely. The origin of the proverb may probably have been derived from the custom among the ancients of holding in their mouth the coins which they received in the sale of their wares. A similar phrase occurs, Cæ. C. 1051. χρυσία κλαίς ἐπὶ γλώσσα βέβακεν. Gl. 35.

21. According as friendship, hospitality, an oath, [supplication], companionship, or purification, was referred to, Jupiter was invoked by the title of φίλιος, ξένιος or ἐφέστιος, ὄρκιος, [ἱκέσιος], ἱεραιεῖος, or καθάρσιος. Gl. 60.

22. Such expressions as ἔστι δ' ὅπη νῦν ἔστι, are used where a

speaker alludes to an unpleasant subject, and thus briefly dismisses it. Gl. 66.

23. It was the custom of the poets, when they made use of a trope somewhat too bold, immediately to subjoin an epithet in order to limit and define its meaning. In the P. V. 828. Æschylus calls *Γρύπας*, *Ζηῆδος κύνας*; but he corrects the metaphor in some degree by adding *ἀκράγεις*, "dogs indeed, but not barking dogs." Sept. Theb. 64. he calls an army *κῦμα*, but adds *χερσαῖον*. Ibid. 82. dust is called a messenger, but *ἄναυδος*. Ibid. 856. he calls Charon's boat *θεαρίδα*; but immediately adds *τὰν ἀστιβῆ ᾠάλλωνι*, to distinguish it from the true *θεαρίς*. Gl. 81.

24. The origin of *ὦ*, *εὐοῖ*, and similar exclamations, is not to be sought in the Greek language, but in that of the nation, to which Greece owes its mythology, sc. the Egyptian. Gl. 144.

25. *Πέρα* is the dative of the obsolete, *πέρα*, *πίρας*, *πέρα*, *πέραν*; and hence the reason why the last syllable is long. Gl. 183.

26. *Ἀνδρῶν*, *γυναικειῶν*, [*παρθενῶν*], &c. were elliptic expressions originally for *ἀνδρῶν*, *γυναικῶν*, [*παρθένων*] (*θάλαμος*) whence the genitive came into use for the nominative. Gl. 235.

27. The participle of the perfect passive is frequently used actively, as *πεπυσμένος*, *ἡκισμένος*, *ἐξηρασμένος*, *πεφραγμένος*, *ἐκκεκομισμένος*, *ἀνακεκομισμένος*, *ἀποδεδειγμένος*, &c. Gl. 252.

28. *Ἀριστον* was the first meal which the ancients took in the morning, and generally about the third hour. Philemon, however, asserts that the meals were *ἀκράτισμα*, *ἄριστον*, *ἐσπέρισμα*, and *δεῖπνον*. Gl. 322.

29. *Λόγχιμος*, *ad hastam pertinens*. Similar forms are *ἔχθιμος*, *κοίνιμος*, *δόκιμος*, *πόμπιμος*, *τρόφιμος*, *ἀρπάγιμος*, *κάρπιμος*, *μύθιμος*, *παραμόνιμος*, *συναγώγιμος*, *ἄλκιμος*, *κάλλιμος*, *κύδιμος*, *αἰφίλιμος*, *αἰδιδιμος*. Verbal adjectives in *ιμος* are of a different class, as *αἰλώσιμος*, and have a certain middle signification between the active and passive. Gl. 895. and Gl. 9.

30. *Ῥίμφα*, celeriter, is derived from *ρίπτω*, the Ionic form of *ρίπτω*; whence *ριμφάλειος* and *ριμφάρματος*. With the same variety, the Ionians, i. e. the Hellenes, said *χρίμπτω* for *χρίπτω*, and *λάμψομαι* for *λήψομαι*. Gl. 397.

31. In compounds from *δρος*, the Ionic form *οὔρος* is retained in *ξύουρος*, *ἀπουρος*, *πρόσυρος*, *τηλουρός*, which is not the case in *δμορος*. Gl. 478.

32. *Ἀναίνομαι*, to deny, is joined with a participle of the person speaking. Gl. 566.

33. Adjectives masculine are sometimes found with feminine substantives, as *Τύχη σωτήρ*, *χεῖρ κρέατωρ*, *πεισὼ θέλειτωρ*. Gl. 647.

34. *Γνέσθω* is a word only used by the poets, Gl. 757.

35. It is doubtful whether the form *χαίνω* in the present is found in the more ancient Greek writers. Gl. 893.

36. "Solebant veteres ante cibum *νίψασθαι* manus, et post cibum *ἀπονίψασθαι*, teste Polluce, quem Stanleius advocavit." Gl. 1004.

37. *Σφαγεῖον*, the vessel which received the blood of victims. [Victima tamen, Troad. 742.] Gl. 1060.

38. *Κέλομαι*, though frequent in Homer, seldom occurs in the tragic writers. Gl. 1088.

39. *Ἐποπτεύω*, inspecto, is a word frequently used by Æschylus, but not by the other tragic writers. Its proper signification, at least in Attic Greek, is to behold the mysteries. Gl. 1241.

40. *Εὐμαρής*, facilis, is formed from an old word *μάρη*, a hand; as from *χείρ*, *εὐχερής*. Gl. 1297.

41. *Πάσσομαι*, vescor, in which sense it is used only in the aorist, and joined with an accusative or genitive. The simple form was *πάω*, whence *πατέω*, and *pasco*: *πάσασθαι*, vesci, has the first syllable *short*; *πάσασθαι*, possidere, has the first syllable *long*. Gl. 1380.

42. *Ἔως*, when it signifies *quamdiu*, and is joined to the perfect, or when with the present it signifies *dum*, does not take the particle *ἄν*: as often as it means *donec*, it requires *ἄν* and the subjunctive mood, or the optative without *ἄν*. Gl. 1410.

43. The plural number [when used for the singular] increases the force of the sentence, whether it be sarcasm or panegyric. Gl. 1414.

44. There is frequent mention of stoning in the ancient writers: which species of punishment was employed by the people when excited by sudden indignation, because stones always lay at hand. Gl. 1606.

45. *Μογέω* is an Homeric word, less frequently used by the tragic writers, with whom the more common word is *μοχθίω*. The primitive root was *μόω* (whence *μόνεο*, by an increase in the number of syllables, and the insertion of the digamma). Hence *μοερός*, *μωρός*, *mobilis*, (whence *ἰόμωρος*, *ἐγγχεσίμωρος*, *ὕλα-κόμεωρος*,) *μόγεις*, *μόγος*, *μόχθος*, &c. Gl. 1614.

46. Words ending in *ίτης* may be called *locals*; as *δαματίτης*, *χωρίτης*, *ἐδρίτης*, *ἐσπερίτης*, &c. Gl. 1640. 941. 47.

CHOEPHORÆ.

1. It may be doubted whether the future of *ἀνάσσω* occurs at all in the Attic poets, V. 125.

2. Ὅπως μὴ, with the future indicative and with the aorist subjunctive, is correct, and therefore there can be no reason why both forms should not be used in the same sentence. V. 260.

3. The first syllable of δαίζω is common in Æschylus, after the example of Homer. V. 390.

4. The particles καὶ δὴ are perhaps never joined with the optative. V. 557.

5. The Greeks said, not πολλὰ δεινὰ, but πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ. V. 578.

6. If τίς ἂν ἀγκαλέσαιτο; (Agam. 989.) τίς ἂν ταῦτα πίβοιτο; (Theb. 1068.) τίς ἂν εὖξαιτο; (Agam. 1312.) &c. be right, τίς λέγοι; cannot be correct. V. 586.

7. A short vowel before a mute with a liquid may be made long in the choral metres. V. 597.

8. Εἶκασα is the more ancient, ἦκασα the more modern Attic. V. 623.

9. Εἰέν· ἀκούω. The lengthening of a short syllable in this place cannot be defended, unless perhaps it was the usual form of the porter's answer; εἰεν· ἀκούω. V. 645.

10. When any one to a question πῶς so answers as to doubt of the question, the reply is made by ὅπως. The same rule applies to τίς, ποῖ, and the like. V. 755.

11. The particles ἀλλ' ἦ are used at the head of interrogative sentences. V. 762.

12. The tragic writers always used πύλη in the plural. V. 866.

13. Φίλτατ' Αἰγίσθου βία. This is the only instance of the circumlocution, βία τινος, joined with an adjective masculine. [Most probably a comma should be placed after φίλτατ', and then there will be no necessity to have recourse to the σχῆμα πρὸς τὸ σημαίνόμενον.] V. 880.

14. Οὐ μὴ with the future indicative *forbids*, with the aorist subjunctive denies. V. 882.

15. The Greeks did not use αὐτὸν for ἐμαυτὸν, though they said αὐτοῦς for ἡμᾶς αὐτούς. V. 1001.

16. Κατέρχομαι signifies to return, as an exile, into his country. Gl. 3.

17. The Greeks, when they attained to the age of puberty, used to cut off their hair, and consecrate it to Apollo *κουροτρόφος*, and to rivers. Theseus commenced the custom, for he consecrated to Delian Apollo the hair which he cut from the fore part of his head. Gl. 6.

18. Τίς is sometimes used for πᾶς τίς, unusquisque. Gl. 53.

19. Φάσκω, dictito, differs from φημί, as βάσκω from βῆμι, διδράσκω from δεῖμι, γιγνώσκω from γινῶμι, [χάσκω from χάω], and

the like. The termination *σκω* denotes repetition of the action. Gl. 87.

20. *Τέξα* in the plural almost always is put for a single bow in the tragic writers. Gl. 155.

21. *Ἐκεί* sometimes signifies, *apud inferos*. Gl. 353.

22. *Æschylus* was partial to words compounded of *κάμνω*, as *δορικμής*, *ἀνδροκμής*, &c. Gl. 359.

23. Feminine nouns ending in *τρια* are derived from masculines in *ης*, as *πολεμιστρια* from *πολεμιστής*, *ἀγύρτρια* from *ἀγυρτής*, *φαιδρύντρια* from *φαιδρυντής*. Gl. 418.

24. *Χαίρειν* is construed with a participle of the verb expressive of the action with which one is delighted. Gl. 442.

25. *Οὔθαρ*, *uber*, peculiar to the other animals; *μαστὸς* was applied to women. Gl. 526.

26. *Ὅπλα* denotes any kind of instruments. Gl. 537.

27. *Ποδαπὸς*, *cujas*, is formed from the ancient pronoun *πὸς*; and the substantive *δάπος*, the ground. Gl. 567.

28. *Πίσομαι* is the ancient future for *πίσομαι* from *πίω*. *Aristophanes* has *πίεται*, the first syllable being long, Eq. 1286. 1398. The more recent form is *πιούμαι*. *Theocritus*, vii. 69. has the first syllable of *πίομαι* short. Gl. 570.

29. *Κίω*, *vado*, is an Homeric word, not used by *Sophocles* or *Euripides*; and from it is derived *κινέω*. Gl. 668.

30. *Ὅπισθόπος*, *pedissequa*, for *ὀπισθόπους*, as *ἀελλόπος*, *Οἰδίπος*, *πουλύπος*, for *ἀελλόπους*, *Οἰδίπους*, *πολύπους*. Gl. 701.

31. The Attics said with the Dorics *διψῆν* and *πεινῆν* for *διψᾶν* and *πεινᾶν*: but this did not extend to the third person singular of the present indicative [probably because there would have been a confusion between the indicative and subjunctive moods]. Gl. 744.

32. *Ἄνω*, *perficieo*, has the penult long in the present, and short in the 2nd aorist. Gl. 786.

33. *Δνοφερὸς*, *tenebricosus*. Except *δνόφος*, *δνοπαλίζω*, and *δνόψ*, no Greek word begins with *δν*. Gl. 797.

34. *Eustathius*, Il. Δ. 467, 44. derives *ἔλεγχος* from *ἐλαῖν ἔγχος*, because most subjects of dispute were decided by arms. This etymology is much more probable than another given in the same place, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλᾶν ἔγχος*. For *ἔλεγχος*, the grasping of the spear to decide a dispute, was the same as the *proof by battle* with the Teutonic nations, and hence it signified any proof; and, by an easy transition, it denoted argument, re-proof, insult. Gl. 838.

35. Of words ending in *στερής*, some have a passive signification, as *πατροστερής*, *ὀμματοστερής*, *βιοστερής*, *ἡλιοστερής*; and some

as active, as ἀργυροστροφής, ἑμματοστροφής, (Eum. 938.) ἡλιοστροφής (Œ. C. 314.). Gl. 989. and 247.

36. Names of winds ending in *las* are formed from other names. Gl. 1054.

NOTICE OF

ΘΗΣΑΥΡΟΣ ΤΗΣ ἙΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΗΣ.
THESAURUS GRÆCÆ LINGUÆ; Ab H.
 STEPHANO constructus. *Editio Nova auctior et
 emendatior. Pr. 41l. Londini: in Ædibus Valpiani.
 1816-1828.*

THE GREEK THESAURUS by the recent publication of the INDEX is now complete in 39 Nos., and we congratulate the editors on the termination of such a stupendous undertaking, carried on amidst much and serious difficulty, though with much aid from private individuals. We may also congratulate scholars in general on the completion of a work, which, whatever may be its imperfections, will nevertheless be found to be an immense storehouse of valuable information on *Greek Lexicography*. We need not enter into any panegyric on the merits of the original work, which are sufficiently known. It is the *crowning* achievement of HENRY STEPHENS, and perhaps in point of general lexicographical excellence, (notwithstanding its errors of omission and commission,) is the first work in any language; and assuredly there is no Greek Lexicon, which can exhibit any, even remote, pretensions to a comparison with it. The most accurate and the most learned Greek Lexicon now in use is that by Schneider, in 2 vols. 4to. with a Supplement; but this Lexicon is very imperfect indeed, and its excellence consists only in particular articles, with which Schneider himself had taken great pains, and especially in the explanations of natural history and of scientific terms. All scholars, who wish to study the Greek language grammatically and philosophically, should have recourse to the THESAURUS of HENRY STEPHENS. From this vast fountain Hemsterhuis, Ruhnken, and Valckenaer, derived much of their great and correct learning. The work from its magnitude is necessarily expensive, and therefore is not within the compass of every pocket; but every school and college-library, and every other public and good private library, should be provided with a copy, which will thus be accessible to the young student.

It is not our intention to enter into any critical examination of the manner in which the editors of the *Thesaurus* have executed their Herculean task; but we propose to set before our readers, many of whom may not have access to the work, the *Dedication*, *Preface*, and *Contents*, which are prefixed to the *INDEX*-Volume. The *Preface* will point out the principal *Ms.* resources employed by the editors in the improvement of the original work, and as the literary characters of the contributors are sketched, it may be read with some little interest. The *INDEX* to so voluminous a work is of course extensive; but the editors have constructed it on a plan best calculated to save room, and we think it right to mention that by the great pains which they have taken to specify the several instances, which occur in the work, of words confounded in Greek *Mss.*, they have done a most acceptable and important service to the critical scholar, which could hardly have been expected from them. When any critic wishes to fortify his conjectural reading of a passage by showing that the *substituted* word is often confounded in Greek *Mss.* with the *rejected* word, he will in many cases find in this *INDEX* references to pertinent examples.

Dedication.—"Gulielmo Wyndham Grenville, Baroni de Grenville, qui suas Athenas, alumnus, moribus, ingenio, doctrina, cancellarius, fide, gravitate, beneficiis, ornavit; qui, dum rerum Britannicarum summam administrabat, regis honorem et dignitatem, patriæ salutem et decus vindicavit et confirmavit; et, quantum in ipso fuit, concordiam inter cives, et æquabilia jura, conciliavit; hoc opus, illius consilio susceptum, liberalitate adjutum, patrocinio perfectum, tantorum meritorum, tantæ laudis, virtutisque, rite memor, summa observantia D. D. D. A. J. VALPY."

Preface.—"Jamque opus exegimus, magnum sane atque haud scimus an ex humanis operibus longe maximum. Per quindecim saltem annos, grande mortalis ævi spatium, onus Ætna gravius nobis videmur sustinuisse, exemptis e media vita tot annis, quibus adolescentes ad juventutem venimus. Hic profecto dies lætissimus nobis illuxit; diu servitutem perpessi sumus; recuperatam libertatem nobis gratulamur. Haud male cecinit doctorum quondam doctissimus, Josephus Scaliger:

Si quem dura manet sententia judicis olim,
 Damnatum ærumnis supplicisque caput:
 Hunc neque fabrilis lassent ergastula massa,
 Nec rigidas vexent fossa metalla manus:
 Lexica contextat; nam cetera quid moror? omnes
 Pœnarum facies hic labor unus habet.

"In uno nimirum Indice conficiendo tres anni elapsi sunt. Nihil enim laboriosius molestiusque ista provincia fingi aut excogitari

potest, in qua oculus et manus potius quam mens atque animus diligentia et industria potius quam ingenium et doctrina postulantur; ad quam suscipiendam scriba potius quam scriptor exigendus est. Qui igitur ad vastissimum Indicem conficiendum se accinxerit, ille mare profundum et immensum se transire sciat, in portum aliquando non nisi ex longissima navigatione perventurum. Horæ quidem cedunt, et dies, et menses, et anni, at interea usque agitur ratis; magna spes eum tenet, at de spe conatuque depellitur; iterum atque sæpius sperat et bono animo est, dum spes ipsa eum deserat, et incertus tanquam in obscura caligine et nocte perpetua feratur.

“J. F. BOISSONANIUS Parisiensis, Professor Græcæ Linguæ celeberrimus, eminet inter eos, qui opem auxiliumque nobis tulerunt. Vir ille elegantissimo ingenio præditus, in omnibus humanitatis ac literarum studiis versatus, Græcis ac Latinis doctrinis pereruditus, ex Patribus Ecclesiasticis, ex Grammaticorum opusculis, atque omnino ex auctoribus, qui vel nondum impressi latent in Bibliotheca Regia, vel quanquam editi sunt, tamen propter raritatem atque adeo caritatem in manibus eruditorum non sunt, multa millia vocabulorum voluntate benignissima summaque diligentia jampridem eruerat ad THESAURUM STEPHANIANUM augendum.

“Magnas quoque gratias et agimus et habemus J. B. GAILLO, Parisiensi Professori, viro humanissimo, tum in aliis literis, tum in grammaticis exercitato, pro quorundam vocabulorum interpretationibus, de quibus minus recte statuerant Henricus noster Stephanus et alii lexicographi;—JOANNI SEAGERO Anglo, viro quem doctrina liberalis et maxime philosophia delectat, pro magna vocabulorum et locutionum multitudine, ex Platone, Aristotele, Tragicis, atque aliis scriptoribus Græcis depromptarum, et luculenter et acute expositarum;—JOANNI SCHWEIGHÆUSERO, clarissimo Argentoratensi Professori, viro optimo, singulari comitate prædito, philologo diligentissimo et doctissimo, in quo jam seniori viget, et usque ad finem vitæ vigeat studium politionis humanitatis et Græcarum literarum, pro annotationibus ipsius utilissimis in THESAURUM STEPHANIANUM et Brunckii manu scriptis in *Scapulae Lexicon*;—HENRICO ARENTIO HAMAKERO, Professori Leidensi, viro linguarum orientalium cognitione præclaro, qui nobis L. C. Valckenærii annotationes in ejusdem *Scapulae Lexicon* impertivit, quibus usi sumus in priori parte THESAURI STEPHANIANI;—JOANNI FRIDERICO SCHLEUSNERO, Lexicis in Novum et Vetus Testamentum utilissimis magnam laudem consecuto, qui vocabulorum quorundam explicationes et libros annotationum in Suidam, Hesychium, aliosque veteres lexicographos nobiscum communicavit;—JOANNI LOVEDAY Armigero, pro exemplari THESAURI STEPHANIANI, ad cujus marginem THOMAS GATAKERUS, nomen inter eruditos clarum et venerabile, multa vocabula scrip-

serat, exquisitaque sua doctrina explicaverat;—ADAMO ASKEVIO Armigero, pro Lexico manu exarato, in quo continentur vocabula ex Theophrasto, Hippocrate, Galeno, aliisque medicis Græcis depromta, et quod bibliothecam patris sui, medici celeberrimi et viri humanissimi, locupletaverat;—et MARTINO JOSEPHO ROUTHIO, viro reverendissimo, singulari et præstantissima virtute, cui ætatis pure et eleganter actæ placida ac lenis incedit senectus, in quo literarum studium adhuc floret, οὐδὲ γυμνάσκει, et quem, omni laude ingenii ac doctrinæ cumulatum, semper sumus admirati, semperque amavimus, pro *Hedericiano Lexico*, cujus margini adscripserat perrara vocabula aut notabiles locutiones, quas legerat in Platone, Aristotele, Clemente Alexandrino, Epiphanio, aliisque scriptoribus Græcis.

“Præter magna hæc subsidia, ab initio operis nobis præsto fuerunt *Lexica* duo *Hedericiana* et *Hesychius* GILBERTI WAKEFIELDII, viri in primis acuti, disert, doctrinæ laude florentis; et cumulus ingentissimus vocabulorum, quæ ABRAHAMUS KALLIUS, ex Græcis scriptoribus tam vetustioribus quam recentioribus, mira industria collegerat, et quorum magnam partem nostros in usus exscripsit GULIELMUS ELBERLING Hafniensis, adolescens comissimus et doctissimus, qui et multa vocabula propria lectione notata ad THESAURUM STEPHANIANUM augendum contulit. GODOFREDO autem HERMANNO, qui inter eruditos facile est princeps, cujus acumen, judicium, et doctrinam omnes gentes suspiciunt et admirantur, et quem virtutibus egregiis præditum maxime amant discipuli sui et amici, agendæ quoque et habendæ sunt gratiæ, pro benevolentia erga nos et multis variisque officiis, præsertimque quod *Disputationem de Particula* “*Av* copiosam, subtilem, eruditam nobis miserit, quam Indici præfixam Lector habet.

“Ex illis vero omnibus, qui consumserunt multum operæ ac laboris in re lexicographica, et quorum volumina manu scripta nobis licuit evolvere, maxima G. H. SCHÆFERO est habenda gratia, cujus *Lexica Hedericiana* et *Schneideriana* continent in marginibus innumerabilia vocabula et memorabilium locutionum uberrimam segetem. Redolet omnis fere pagina doctrinam illam summam, atque acumen ingenii subtilissimum, et judicium limatum et politum, quæ verum grammaticum, criticum, philologum exhibent, et quæ Bentleii Porsonisque esse propria clamarent omnia gymnasia atque omnes scholæ.

“Tandem aliquando opus finitum et in lucem proditum est. Habent vero Subscriptores nostri THESAURUM STEPHANIANUM non modo integrum, sed etiam innumeris additamentis auctum. Neque tamen est hic noster Thesaurus perfecte absolutus, sed qualem pro nostra ingenii et doctrinæ mediocritate conficere potuimus. Defectus saltem varios in THESAURO STEPHANIANO supplevimus; errores permultos sine dubio sustulimus; nec male, liceat nobis dicere, meriti sumus de republica literaria.

“Exoriatur vero aliquis ingenio præstanti, eruditione perfecta; diligentiaque summa, cujus opus sub felicioribus auspiciis, in optimis temporibus, regio sumtu inchoatum, omnibus suis numeris et partibus expletum, universo eruditorum clamore et plausu comprobetur!”

CONSPECTUS EORUM QUÆ IN HAC THESAURI
STEPHANIANI EDITIONE CONTINENTUR.

HENRICI STEPHANI Admonitio de Thesauri sui Epitome, quæ titulum Lexici Græco-Latini Novi præfert—Epistola Dedicatoria, et Epigrammata duo de Thesaurio Gr.—Catalogus Auctorum Græcorum, e quorum Scriptis Vocabula et loquendi Genera, eorum item unde Expositiones Vocabulorum aut loquendi Generum petitiæ sunt in hoc Thesaurio Græcæ Linguæ—Scipionis Carteromachi Pistoriensis Oratio de Laudibus Literarum Græcarum—M. Antonii Antimachi de Literarum Græcarum Laudibus Oratio—Conradi Heresbachii Oratio in Commendationem Græcarum Literarum—H. Stephani ad Lectorem Epistola, seu Præfatio in suum Thesaurum Linguæ Græcæ—Excerpta ex H. Stephani Epistola, a. 1559. edita, qua ad multas multorum Amicorum respondet, de suæ Typographiæ Statu, nominatimque de suo Thesaurio Linguæ Græcæ—Excerpta ex J. A. Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca; Lexica Græco-Latina recentiorum—Excerpta ex Vita H. Stephani Secundi; a Mic. Maître conscripta—De Verbis Græcorum Mediis Commentationes L. Kusteri, J. Clerici, S. Clarkii, et E. Schmidii, recensuit, auxit, suamque adjecit Chr. Wolle; cum Dresigii et Bowyeri Notis—P. P. M. Ogerius de Linguæ Græcæ Affinitate cum Hebraica—J. A. Ernesti de Vestigiis Linguæ Hebraicæ in Lingua Græca Oratio—LEXICON VOCUM PEREGRINARUM IN SCRIPTORIBUS GRÆCIS OBIARUM: in quo comprehenduntur: —Excerpta e Chr. D. Beckii Dissertatione de Lexicis Græcis et Latinis omnino, et recentissimis singulatim—P. E. Jablonskii Disquisitio de Lycaonica et aliis Linguis—Fr. Guil. Sturzii de Dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina Liber—P. E. Jablonskii Glossarium Vorum Ægyptiarum, cum J. Guil. Tewateri Auctario—L. C. Valckenærii Dissertatio de Vocabulo Βάρις—Spicilegium Vorum Ægyptiarum: post Jablonskium, Tewaterum, et Sturzum collegerunt Thesauri Stephaniani Editores—Addenda et Corrigenda in Spicilegium Vorum Ægyptiarum—J. G. Dahleri Lexicon Vorum Peregrinarum in Græcis Auctoribus, Glossographis maxime, obviarum—Vocabula a Dahlero prætermissa—THESAURUS LINGUÆ GRÆCÆ, ab H. Stephano constructus—Addenda huic Thesaurio—Godofredi Hermanni Dissertatio de Particula *Α—Index Thesauri novi Stephaniani.

GLOSSARIA, ET ALIA OPUSCULA.

Cyrilli, Philoxeni, aliorumque Veterum Auctorum Glossaria,

Græco-Latina et Latino-Græca, a Carolo Labbæo collecta, plurimis in locis ab Editoribus Thesauri Græci Stephaniani emendata.—Bon. Vulcanii Brug. Notæ et Castigationes in Glossaria utriusque Linguae—Colloquia duo Vetera Græco-Latina; Colloquium Scholasticum; Excerpta e Verweii Præfatione ad Novam Viam Docendi Græca—Niciarii Interrogationes et Responsiones; Carfilidis Interrogationes et Responsa; Responsa Sapientum—Præcepta in Delphis ab Apolline in Columna scripta secus Deum—Collectio Vocum, quæ pro diversa Significatione Accentum diversum accipiunt, Auctore Cyrillo, seu potius Philopono—Veteres Glossæ Verborum Juris, quæ passim in Basilicis reperiuntur, a Carolo Labbæo edita, cum Excerptis e Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, Antonii Schultingii Præfatione, Additionibus e Libro Ms., Jos. Scaligeri et aliorum Emendationibus, et Notis ejusdem Ant. Schultingii—Hadriani Sententiæ, Responsa, Rescripta, et Epistolæ, cum Excerptis de Dositheo e Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, et cum Goldastii Notis—Verborum quorundam Themata, quæ magna ex parte vel sunt Anomala, vel Poetica, aut certe ejusmodi, ut non obviam cuilibet habeant Originem—De Græcæ Linguae Dialecticis e Scriptis Joannis Grammatici, quæ Τεχνικὰ fuerunt inscripta; De Dialectis a Corintho decerptis; E Plutarcho Excerpta de Dialectis, et Homericæ earum Usu; Ex eodem Plutarcho Excerpta de Tropis, et Homericæ eorum Usu; De Schematis, et Homericæ eorum Usu, ex eodem Plutarcho—De Passionibus Dictionum, e Tryphone Grammatico; Ejusdem Opuscula quædam, e Museo Critico Cantabrigiensi, cum Notis C. J. Blomfieldii, Episcopi olim Cestrensis, nunc Londinensis, excerptis e Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca—Herodiani de Notis Numerorum Tractatus—De Mensuris et Ponderibus, Libellus Galeni, e Collatione cum iis, quæ apud Paulum Ægin. et Schol. Nicandri leguntur, emendatus—De Mensibus et Partibus eorundem, cum Excerptis e Matthæi Glossariis Græcis Minoribus—Ammonii de Similibus et Differentibus Vocabulis Libellus, cum Excerptis e Fabricii Bibliotheca Græca, Valckenærii Præfatione, Notis, et Animadversionibus integris; Nova Editio correctior, et Notis e Schæferi editione Lipsiensi A. D. 1822., atque ea, quam continet Scapulæ Lexicon Oxoniense A. D. 1820., depromptis aucta. Cui accesserunt e Valckenærii editione Opuscula Eranii Philonis de Differentia Significationis, Lesbonactis de Figuris Grammaticis, Anonymi de Solæcismo et Barbarismo, Lexicon de Spiritibus Dictionum, e Tryphone, Chærobosco, Theodorito, et aliis collectum, cum Notis e Schæferi editione atque Oxoniensi Scapulæ Lexici editione desumptis—Τάξις Παλαιὰ καὶ Ὁνομασίαι τῶν Ἀρχόντων, secundum H. Stephani Editionem, Kusterianum Suidam, et Montefalconii Bibliothecam Coislinianam, e qua desumpta sunt Ὁνόματα τῶν Ἀρχόντων—Orbicii Περὶ τῶν περὶ τὸ Σπράτευμα Τάξεων—H. Stephani Commentarius de Atticæ Linguae seu Dialecti Idiomatis.

NOTICE OF

Ἡ ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ: The NEW TESTAMENT; with English Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory. A New Edition, in 3 vols. 2l. 5s. London, 1826. 8vo. Longman.

THIS edition was prepared by the REV. EDWARD VALPY, who has been for many years the Head-Master of Norwich School. It is dedicated to Dr. Bathurst, the venerable Bishop of Norwich, in the following terms:—"An edition of the New Testament should be dedicated to Virtue, Learning, and Piety,—to him, whose life is a fair transcript of the Christian character. I presume, therefore, my Lord, with sentiments of respect, regard, and gratitude, to present this edition to your Lordship; and I remain, my Lord, your Lordship's obliged and humble Servant, E. V."

The merits of this work, as originally published, were sufficiently appreciated by the literary public, and in its present state of improvement it has additional claims to their preference. The following *Advertisement* is short enough to be within the limits of quotation, and from it the reader will learn the principal alterations which distinguish this edition:—

"A writer in the British Critic, who reviewed the former edition of the Greek Testament, concluded his able and judicious criticism in these words: 'We wish well enough to this edition, for the sake of the notes, which we have scrutinised with some care, to hope that the editor may be induced to incorporate the text of the editio princeps in his second impression. Were this carefully effected, and the notes extended with copious extracts from the Bishop of Calcutta's profound and learned volume, which we place in the very first rank of those works with which sacred literature has been enriched by modern ingenuity, we could safely recommend it as the very best book of the kind, with which we are acquainted, for the use of the student in divinity.' In following this recommendation, the Editor has availed himself, to the utmost, of Bishop Middleton's work; as he has also of the assistance of other most eminent commentators and critics, in comparing, selecting, and adopting what he thought to be the true sense and the most satisfactory interpretation of each passage.

"One important departure from the former edition will be immediately perceived. As his primary and most important object was extensive usefulness and inducement to study the book of life, he determined, after mature consideration, to give the notes in English. In this he has followed the example of our most learned divines and critics, who in offering the result of their pious labors to the English student in divinity, did not think it necessary to adopt the Latin language, though consecrated by the usage of ancient, and of German, critics. Nor is there any fear that the language, however plain and

Notice of Valpy's *New Greek Testament*. 157

simple, should, on such a sacred ground, be found to shock the most refined taste, or offend the judgment, of the most fastidious scholar.

"As the notes on St. Matthew are full and copious, there was less necessity in many instances, especially in the parallel passages, for the same extended mode of illustration, in the other Evangelists; but a frequent reference is made from the one to the other: and thus the student is induced to consult and to compare the whole body of annotations, and is thus enabled to fix more durably on his mind the result and fruit of his industry and research. Verbal criticism is also introduced, and observations on the Greek idiom from Vigerus, on the ellipses from Bos, and on the particles from Hoogeveen; with corrections, where it appeared necessary, of our venerated, but, in some instances, erroneous English version. Some imperfections will, it is feared, have insinuated themselves in the notes; but if pointed out or discovered, they shall be corrected or remedied, should a future impression be required. That the Lord may bless and prosper this Work, and that it may tend to the glory of God, by a greater diffusion of the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the Editor's most ardent prayer."

We doubt whether the editor has done sufficient justice to the superiority of this edition; for on examining the notes, we find that many quotations are given from Campbell, Gilpin, Doddridge, Hales, Harmer, Shaw, Townson, Whitby, and others, which do not appear in the first edition. We have examined several of the notes, and can speak with confidence of the editor's taste and judgment, knowledge and research. Pertinent matter has been collected with great care; and throughout the work the object of the editor has been to set before his readers useful information from every available source, not to display his own ingenuity by fanciful and recondite interpretations, or to make a parade of his learning by frequent and elaborate and unnecessary quotations. The young divine will find this work not only a *safe* guide in his studies, but the *best* guide which he can obtain within the compass of the same price and size.

On *Matth.* xiii. 31. the editor has the following note:—"Lightfoot and Buxtorf quote from the writings of the Rabbies, that a species of the *sinapi* rose to the size of a tree. See also Scheuchzer *Phys. Sacr.* R. Simeon said, 'I had in my ground a mustard-plant, into which I was wont to climb, as one may climb up into a fig-tree.' *Hieros.* p. 7. f. 20. 2."

The account of the mustard-tree in Dr. Harris's *Natural History of the Bible*, Lond. 1824, p. 274, is this:—"A well-known garden-herb. Christ compares the kingdom of heaven to 'a grain of mustard-seed, which a man took and sowed in the earth; which indeed,' said he, 'is the least of all seeds, but, when it is grown, is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.' This expression will not seem strange, says Sir Tho-

Hunc olim Rhedycina canet, quotiesque recenset
 Grata suos, celebresque memor per sæcula cives,
 Insignem ante alios felix memorabit alumnum.
 Nec te, Castalidum proles¹ lectissima, plectro
 Musa ingrata silet, cui fontes ipsa reclusit
 Integros Pallas, facilisque indulsit Apollo,
 Musæoque dedit contingere dicta lepore.

At neque dilectis solum penetralia Musis
 Condidit Alfredus, soli sua limina Phæbo;
 Jura etiam, sapiens et servantissimus æqui,
 Edocuit, quaque est stabilis res publica norma:
 Quin artes, fautore illo, subiere repente
 Ignotæ; tum nauta vagus dare vela patenti
 Ausus erat pelago, atque alienas quærere terras;
 Contemnensque æquor tumidum victricia classis
 Arma tulit late, Danis dominata fugatis,
 Et patrium advexit peregrina in regna Draconem.
 Quinetiam artifices externa e gente profecti
 Illius accitu coëunt; pars mœnibus urbes
 Cingere, solertique manu superaddere formas
 Spirantes, vivosque excudunt marmore vultus;
 Dum calamo interea varioque colore figuras
 Mentitur veras et ludit arundine pictor.
 Nec minus in bello virtus, insigniit hosti
 Parcentem victo, debellantemque ferocem:
 Nam neque ventoso tulit hunc in prælia curru
 Ambitio, neque regnandi tam dira cupido
 Impulit infando vicina lacessere regna
 Marte; sed infidi cum fœdus rumpere Dani
 Auderent, nutu novit componere bellum,
 Et conjuratis potuit dare jura tyrannis.

O! quis me ducet qua Faringdonia clivo
 Assurgit viridi, sublimi a vertice montis
 Lætus ubi intentos pascens per singula visus
 Explorare humiles campos, subjectaque possim
 Mœnia, et eductas non nullo numine turres!
 Hic ulmos inter patulas caput erigit alma
 Alfredi nutrix Wantagia: sæpe sub umbra
 Hac puer, agresti meditatus arundine musam;
 Sæpe hanc ad lympham, subductæ in margine ripæ,
 Parvulus incerto se lusu exercuit heros.
 Colle ex adverso candenti e rupe minacem

¹ Addison.

Surgere equum, rudibusque notis expressa videbis
Tendere terga solo, longoque albescere tractu.
Hic olim stravit duro certamine Danos
Alfredus, postquam defessa Britannia longo
Servitio, imperiumque pati plagasque superbas
Victoris nollet, rursusque reposceret arma.
Hinc procul apparet felix Rhedycina, remotis
Indiciis, media riguæ convallis in umbra;
Vixque acie possunt oculi servare domorum
Tecta; et cœruleis occultas nubibus ædes;
Has inter veneranda, immanique ardua mole,
Radclivii stat pulchra domus, medioque superbit
Ampla situ, qualis Vaticani inclyta sedes
Erigitur cœlo, aut Capitoli immobile saxum
Subjectam late prospexit desuper urbem.
At prope moliri cernas nova culmina, eodem
Radclivio fundante: viden', jam turris aperto
Emicat aspectu, propriumque affectat Olympum.
Et mox tempus erit, cum certa lege planetas
Errantes, magni attentos ad jussa Parentis,
Newtoni explorent alii, qui fœdera noscant
Naturæ, arcanasque vias, ut menstrua luna
Accendit sub nocte facem, radiisque relucet
Oppositis, medio dum sol immotus in axe
Igue indefesso fulget, cinctusque ministris
Ipse regit seriem, et volventes ordinat annos.

Musarum augustæ sedes, sacrataque tecta
Quæ cœlo æquavit pietas, et opima priorum
Munera condecorant, salvete!—ut perculit ardor
Cor mihi, dum recolo prisci monumenta laboris,
Et decus antiquum, et tantæ primordia famæ!
Tuque! O sancta domus! longaue ætate verenda,
Cujus in hospitium, qua primum sede receptæ,
Alfredo monstrante, choro duxere Camœnæ,
Ante alias, salve! celebrat dum musa patronum
Communem, veterique refert hæc vota parenti;
Interea tu firma diu, longosque per annos
Stes immota, novo surgentes vertice turres
Conspiciens, sociosque lares circum undique cultu
Magnifico, qualis patrii per limen Olympi
Invehitur regina deum, turritaue tollit
Tempora, et innumeros cōplectitur una nepotes.

WARTON,

COLL. TRIN.

NOTICE OF

*PLATONIS, et quæ vel Platonis esse feruntur vel Platonica solent comitari, SCRIPTA GRÆCE OMNIA, ad Codices Manuscriptos recensuit, Variasque inde Lectiones diligenter enotavit, IMMANUEL BEKKER. Annotationibus integris Stephani, Heindorfii, Heusdii, Wytttenbachii, Lindavii, Boeckhii, adji-
cuntur modo non integræ Serrani, Cornarii, Thompsoni, Fischeri, Gottleberi, Astii, Butmanni, et Stalbau-
mi, necnon et Commentariis aliorum curiose excerpta. 11 vols. 7l. 14s. small paper, and 11l. 11s. large. London. Excudebat A. J. Valpy, A.M. sumtibus R. PRIESTLEY. 1826.*

AMONGST the numerous and useful publications undertaken by the enterprising spirit of Mr. R. Priestley, this edition of Plato may be fairly said to hold the first place. We are not ignorant that such an assertion will appear to some as the *ne plus ultra* of puffing. But he, who deems it (and what honest man does not?) a base dereliction of a moral duty to speak aught but the truth, will at all times and in all places disdain to withhold his opinion in deference to those little men of still less minds, who cannot hear praise freely and fully given to A, without the fear of giving offence to the feelings of B; and still less will he be disposed to yield to the prejudices of others, who can give the best reasons for the faith that is in him. Of these all-sufficient reasons, some have reference to the plan of the undertaking, and some to the execution. As far as regards the plan, to Mr. Priestley be all the honor given for the idea of presenting at one view and in the same page the most approved text, the fullest body of various readings, together with the most ample collection of Latin commentaries either intire or extracted, and of enriching the whole with the Greek Scholia, the Lexicon of Timæus, the Latin Translation of Ficinus; all preceded by Fischer's elaborate Prolegomena, containing the Life of the Philosopher, and a Literary History of his works whether extant or lost, together with a Bibliographical Notice¹ of Mss. Edi-

¹ From the value not undeservedly set on the *Notitia Literaria* of the Bipontine editors, we are sorry that no advantage has been taken in the present edition to incorporate that *Notitia* with Fischer's less perfect account.

Notice of Variorum Edition of Plato. 163

tions and Translations; and thus forming the most desirable edition, that has yet appeared, of the remains of the mighty, magnificent, and immortal philosopher of Athens.

With regard to the manner, in which the plan of the projector has been put into execution, we will let the Editor¹ speak for himself by giving his preface intire; from which it will be seen that although not a little has been done and well, more might have been done and better, in the way rather of abridgment than amplification: so true is the sentiment of Hesiod, "Few know how much the half exceeds the whole."

In hac Editione quid præstitutum fuerit, paucis, Lector, accipe. Commoditatibus legentium unice consulitur. Igitur Textus, quod aiunt, et Annotationes ita comparantur, ut nihil fere, quod ad Platonica quivis intelligenda desideret, deesse videatur. Etenim Platonis ipsius verba recensio, quam Immanuel Bekker ope Codicum Manuscriptorum numero circiter octoginta fecit, hic repetita exhibet, emendatis subinde paucis iisdemque levioribus maculis, quas Editoris modo non oculatissimi incuria prætermisit. Deinde Commentarii, partim integri partim compendiose facti adjiciuntur, quibus et æris et temporis dispendium, utcumque immensum, postulantis, carere tamen studiosus ægre tulerit. Verum ne cui mole Annotationum onerari potius quam ornari Platonica viderentur, lege severa cautum fuit: ideoque e præstantioribus duntaxat Commentarii repetuntur integri; e reliquis vero seliguntur ea, quæ Platonica quodammodo decere, neque scriptores ipsos dedecere potuerint. In hac tamen parte non minimum fuisse laborem exantlandum quivis tuto colligere potest, catalogo librorum perfecto, unde sunt Annotationes decerpitæ:

SERRAN. } ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΑΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΣΥΖΩΜΕΝΑ. Platonis Opera quæ ex-
STEPH. } stant omnia. Ex nova Joannis Serrani Interpretatione, perpetuis
ejusdem notis illustrata. Henr. Stephani de quorundam locorum inter-
pretatione judicium, et multorum contextus Græci emendatio.
1578, fol.

CORNAR.—Jani Cornarii Eclogæ in Dialogos Platonis omnes, nunc primum separatim editæ, cura Joh. Frider. Fischeri. Lips. 1771, 8vo.

THOMPSON.—ΠΑΡΜΕΝΙΔΗΣ, Η ΠΕΡΙ ΙΔΕΩΝ. Parmenides, sive de Ideis et Uno Rerum Principio. Platonis Dialogus. Oxon. 1728, 8vo.

FORSTER.—Platonis Dialogi quinque, Erastæ, Euthyphro, Apologia Socratis, Crito, Phædo. Oxon. 1745, 1752, 1765, 8vo.

ETWALL.—Platonis Dialogi III, quibus præfiguntur Olympiodori Vita Platonis et Albini in Dialogos Platonis Introductio. Oxon. 1771, 8vo.

FISCHER.—1. Platonis Euthyphro, Apologia Socratis, Crito, Phædo. Græce. Lips. 1768, 1779, 1783, 8vo.

¹ The individual to whose care this edition was intrusted is, we understand, George Burges; a scholar, whose claims to the consideration of the learned were, as far as Plato is concerned, duly appreciated by the late and lamented Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, Peter Paul Dobree, who was accustomed to speak of this edition in the most flattering terms.

- FISCHER.—2. *Platonis Cratylus et Theætetus*. Lips. 1779, 8vo.
 3. ——— *Sophista, Politicus, Parmenides*. Lips. 1779, 8vo.
 4. ——— *Philebus et Symposium*. Lips. 1779, 8vo.
 5. *Æschinis Socratici Dialogi tres*. Græce. Lips. 1786, 8vo.
- GOTTLIEBER.—1. *Animadversiones ad Platonis Phædonem et Alcibiadem Secundum*. Lips. 1771, 8vo.
 2. *Platonis Menexenus*. Lips. 1782, 8vo.
- MÜLLER.—*Platonis Ion*. Hamburg. 1782, 12mo.
- ROUTH.—*Platonis Euthydemus et Gorgias*. Oxon. 1784, 8vo.
- BIPONT.—*Platonis Philosophi, quæ exstant*. Biponti, 1787, 8vo.
- BIESTER. } *Platonis Dialogi IV. Meno, Crito, Alcibiades uterque*. Berolini,
 GEDIKE. } 1790, 8vo.
- RAABE.—*Specimen interpretandi Platonis Dialogi, qui Crito inscribitur*. Lips. 1791, 4to.
- NURNBERGER.—*Platonis Alcibiades Primus et Secundus*. Lips. 1796, 8vo.
- FINDEISEN.—*Platonis Gorgias*. Goth. 1796, 8vo.
- HEINDORF.—1. *Platonis Lysis, Charmides, Hippias Major, Phædrus*. Berolini, 1802, 8vo.
 2. ——— *Gorgias et Theætetus*. 1805, 8vo.
 3. ——— *Gorgias, Apologia Socratis, Hippias Major, Charmides*. Berolini, 1805, 8vo.
 4. ——— *Cratylus, Parmenides, et Euthydemus*. 1806, 8vo.
 5. ——— *Phædo, Sophista, et Protagoras*. 1810, 8vo.
- HEUSDE.—*Specimen Criticum in Platonem*. Lugd. Bat. 1803, 8vo.
- BOECKH.—1. *In Platonis, qui vulgo fertur, Minoëm; ejusdemque Libros priores de Legibus*. Halis Saxonum, 1806, 8vo.
 2. *Simonis Socratici Dialogi*. Heidelb. 1810, 8vo.
- WYTTENBACH.—*Platonis Phædon*. Lugd. Bat. 1810, 8vo.
- AAT.—1. *Platonis Symposium et Alcibiades I*. Landshut. 1809, 8vo.
 2. ——— *Phædrus. Adjiçuntur Hermiæ Scholia nunc primum edita*. Lips. 1810, 8vo.
 3. ——— *Politia. Accedunt Additamenta ad Commentarium in Phædrum*. Lips. 1814, 8vo.
 4. ——— *Leges et Epinomis*. Lips. 1814, 8vo.
- FAHSE.—*Sylloge Lectionum Græcarum*. Lips. 1813, 8vo.
- LINDAU.—*Novum in Platonis Timæum et Critiam Conjecturarum atque Emendationum Specimen*. Vratislaviæ ad Viadrum, 1815, 8vo.
- BECK.—*Platonis Opera*. Lips. 1816, 12mo.
- STUTZMANN.—*Plato de Philosophia, vel Dialogus, qui inscribitur ΕΡΑΧΤΑΙ*. Erlang. 1818, 8vo.
- STALBAUM.—1. *Platonis Philebus. Accesserunt Olympiodori Scholia nunc primum edita*. Lips. 1820, 8vo.
 2. ——— *Euthyphro*. Lips. 1823, 12mo.
- LANGE.—*Specimen Criticum in Platonis Critonem*. Lips. 1821, 8vo.
- BUTTMANN.—*Platonis Dialogi IV. Meno, Crito, Alcibiades uterque*. Berolini. 1822, 8vo.
- NITZCH.—*Platonis Dialogus Ion*. Lips. 1822, 8vo.
- DINDORF.—*Platonis Convivium*. Lips. 1823, 8vo.
- GROEN-VAN-PRINSTERER.—*Prosopographia Platonica*. Lugd. Bat. 1823, 8vo.
- LOEWS.—*Platonis Menexenus*. Colon. ad Rhen. 1824, 12mo.
- LOEWE.—*Platonis Crito, Græce, cum commentatio perpetuo et pleno, in usum Juventutis Scholasticæ*. Lips. 1825.

Harum Editionum Annotationumque merita singulatim expendere neque temporis est hujus neque loci. Unum id dicere sufficit, quod e messe tam larga Commentariorum ne levissimum quidem spicilegium Editoribus relinquitur futuris, nisi quibus volupe fuerit, Herculei sane laboris opus, materiam corradere, ad Glossarium Platonicum conficiendum; quibus profecto subsidium haud exiguum daturi sunt Indices, tam Vocabulorum quam Dictionum, quos Forster, Etwall, Fischer, Findeisen, Butmann, Heindorf et Stalbaum struxerunt: quo quidem ornamento hæc Editio minime fuisset expers, si quis repertus esset ad munus illud obeundum par. Verum enimvero ætas *Διδύμων τῶν χαλκεντέρων* jamjam præterlapsa est, heul non reditura.

Præfatiunculam prius claudere nefas est, quam lector fuerit enixe rogatus, æquo anime tam commissa quam omissa ferre, si forte offenderit vel in voces aut nullo aut prave picto accentus signo notatas, vel in nomen Fischeri loco Forsteri aut versa vice suffectum, vel in alia cujuscunque generis peccata, quæ diligens lectio perspecta corrigit, vel indiligens haud perspecta parum est curatura.

From the mere perusal of this list of commentators some idea may be formed of the pains which have been taken to render this edition valuable to the general reader; while to the more inquisitive scholar, who would otherwise be compelled to wade through volume after volume of endless annotations, it will be gratifying to learn that, in the *Phædo* for instance, the notes, which in other editions occupy upwards of 1000 octavo pages, are here compressed, without a single omission of importance, into a third of that space, and this too including the text and the body of various readings, which the industry of Immanuel Bekker¹ has collected from nearly every Ms. at present in existence.

As this publication professes to contain nothing original from the pen of the Editor himself, it is unnecessary to enter on a critical examination of the text and notes: on both of which much might be said, and especially in the way of admonition, to those who wish to know what Plato really wrote, to consult the various readings of the Ms. marked *v.* which, though one of the most modern, being said to be written in the 16th century, frequently alone preserves the very words of the author. Something might also be said of the intrinsic value of the Aldine, the second Basle, and H. Stephens' editions, and of the contemptible Bipont, which was once dignified by bibliographers with the title of *ed. opt.*: and not a little might be

¹ A complaint has been made by some continental critics of the inaccuracy of Bekker's collation. But without entering on the justice of the accusation, it is sufficient to reply, that if the charge be true to its fullest extent, still enough and more than enough has been done by Bekker to demand and obtain the heartfelt thanks of every admirer of Plato.

added on the subject of the Mss. used respectively by Ficinus and Cornarius, and of other Latin translations, either anonymous, or those which pass under the name of Aretinus, and other well-known Italian writers; but on these points the want of room prevents us from stating all we wish; and to do it *perfunctorie*, befits neither the importance of the subject, the reader's intelligence, nor the credit of the writer.

NOTICES OF FOREIGN WORKS,

WHICH MAY BE HAD OF MESSRS. BLACK AND CO.

Prisciani Grammatici de Laude Imperatoris Anastasii et de Ponderibus et Mensuris Carmina. Alterum nunc primum, alterum plenius edidit et illustravit STEPH. LAD. ENDLICHER, Hungarus Posoniensis. Vindobonæ, 1828.

A Palimpsest Codex, in the library at Vienna, which formerly belonged to the Convent of Bobbio in Lombardy, was found to contain a poem of Priscian, "de Laude Imperatoris Anastasii," hitherto unpublished. Mabillon had seen the Codex at Naples, in the Convent of St. Joan. de Carbonaria, where it had been transferred from Bobbio; and he makes mention of the poem (*Mus. Ital.* i. p. 110.); and some parts of it were published by the Jesuit Denis, librarian at Vienna in the time of Joseph II.: but he was deterred, by the difficulties attending the reading of it, from publishing the whole. The same Codex contains also another poem, "de Ponderibus et Mensuris;" of which an incomplete edition has already been published at Leipsic, in 1494, consisting of 162 verses and a half. The last edition of it, by J. C. Wernsdorf, (*Poët. Lat. Min. Paris, 1825.*) contains the same number of verses. The Vienna Codex contains the whole poem, in 208 verses. It belongs to the 7th or 8th century, and is written in Longobardic characters. Every doubt about the writer of the poem *De Laude Anastasii* is removed by the hypograph: "Expliciunt laudes . . . dictæ a Prisciano Grammatico." The other poem has been ascribed to Rhemnius Fannius Palæmon, or to Remus Favinus.

The following verses form the preface to the poem *De Laude Anastasii*:—

Summi poëtæ, quæ solent in versibus,
Quos Imperatorum modulantur laudibus
Proferre, cælum cum petunt et sidera
Adversa naturæ sequentes impie,
Tibi sciens, quod displicent nimis pio,
Nihil nefandum, nil nisi verum loqnar;
Nam qui tribuit mortalibus cœlestia
Sapientium damnatur arbitrio pari;
Et si quæ vere prædicat non creditur
Cum falsa ceperit canens exordia.

Quare precor libenter audias tua
 Quæ cuncta non ego potero producere,
 Non mille dentur si mihi linguæ simul,
 Fons ingeni si carmen effundens novum :
 Sed parte ferre qua valeo pro viribus
 Decerpta lucem conferat quæ cantibus
 Quod more miro fit, solent nam carmina
 Addere decus rebus magis quam sumere.
 Deo favente jam subibo pondera
 Laudis serenus quæ relevat cultus mihi,
 Præsens ubique cernitur qui sensibus
 Arcana nudans principis mitissimi.

The poem itself consists of 312 hexameter verses. The editor has accompanied both poems with a copious commentary.

Philippi Melancthonis Opera Omnia, denuo diligenter collecta, in ordinem redacta, et ad optimas quæ extant editiones inter se comparatas edita ab JOANNE ANDREA DETZER. Vol. I. Pars Prior et Posterior, Locos Theologicos continens. Erlangæ, 1828.

This new edition of Melancthon will contain some unpublished works of the same author. The editor, we are sorry to perceive, seems to doubt of the success of his undertaking, and announces to the public "*Novam editionem Ph. Melancthonis operum modico pretio parabilem*;" adding, "*Quod inceptum nostrum si bonorum piorumque virorum comprobationem non tulerit, primo volumine hæc opera nostra finietur.*" We hope, therefore, he will meet with encouragement not only in Germany, but also in other Protestant countries. If so, he intends publishing the works of Melancthon in the following order: first, the *Theologica*, divided into Exegetica, Historica, and Dogmatica; then the *Philosophica* and *Philologica*; and finally, the *Epistolæ*, with an account of the life of Melancthon, by Joh. Camerarius. The *Loci Theologici*, just published, is printed from the Basil edition of Oporin. 1561. The edition has added a useful '*Index locorum et præcipuorum capitum quæ in singulis locis tractantur*,' besides an '*Elenchus locorum Sacræ Scripturæ in hoc libro obiter explicatorum*,' and an '*Index rerum*.'

Specimen Adversariorum in Sermones Platonis, cui præmissa est dissertatio de Horat. Sermon. I. l. i. Scripsit F. G. GRASER. Lipsiæ, 1828.

The writer finds fault with the following passage of Horace :

"Illuc, unde abii, redeo. Nemone, ut avarus,
 Se probet, ac potius laudet diversa sequentes?"

He proposes '*nemo nam*' instead of '*nemone*,' which would give it this sense: for if it is granted that a miser does not, &c. and he shows that '*ne ut*' implies a negation, as, *Egone ut faciam?* *Ὁ μὴ ποίησω*; *Egone ut te adversum mentiar, mater mea?* joined with '*nemo*,' the sentence would become affirmative, which evidently it ought not to be. The author writes generally very good Latin, but the following sentence (p. 9.) we do not admire: "*qui quidem (avarus)*

hoc unum dum omni studio agit, ut omnes *se* ditiores, in summa festinandi contentione tamen *se* semper ab aliis rursus *se* ditioribus superari cum infinito dolore suo intelliget." The Adversaria to Plato are of a critical, grammatical, and lexicographical nature, and prove the author to be a worthy pupil of Hermann; of whom he most emphatically says in the concluding passage, "illius admirabile in omni rerum genere exemplum intueor, atque verba, vitam, vultum ipsum animo mirifice commoto contemplor."

De Fontibus Historiarum T. Livii Commentatio Altera. Scripsit F. LACHMANN. Commentatio de Sententia amplissimi Philosophorum ordinis, Acad. Goett. Præmio ornata. Göttingæ, 1828.

The 'Commentatio prima' appeared in 1822; and in the same year Lachmann published another Commentary, 'de die Aliensi aliisque diebus religiosis veterum Romanorum.' The present Commentary treats first 'de libris deperditis xi.—xx.:' and shows from Eutropius, Orosius, and others, that Livy followed Fabius Pictor Tubero, Claud. Quadrigarius, and Piso; but that he made little use of Cato, of the Commentaries of Pyrrhus, and even of Polybius, in the account of the first Punic war. It appears that he frequently relied on doubtful authorities, and followed the tide of national prejudice. This applies especially to the fabulous account of the death of Regulus, epit. l. xviii., and of the captivity of Corn. Asina, epit. xvii. In treating of lib. xxi.—xlvi. a full account is given by the author of the manner in which Livy availed himself of Polybius, F. Pictor, L. Cincius Alimentus, M. P. Cato, L. Coelius Antipater, L. Calpurn. Piso, Q. Claud. Quadrigarius, Clodius Licinus, C. Acilius, Q. Valerius Antius, L. Macer, Q. Ælius Tubero, P. Rutilius Rufus, and Silenus, § 4—17: next follows an inquiry, how much credit may be due to Livy where he is the sole authority. Thus the story about breaking rocks with vinegar is shown not to be an invention of Livy; it was generally credited among the ancients: cf. Agatharchidas ap. Hudson. in Geog. Min. Diod. iii. 12. Plin. xxxiii. sect. 21 and 23, and the Scholiast to Juvenal x. 153, who says "Diducit scopulos, et montem rupit aceto." Thus Livy is defended against several imputations of Folard, Guischard, &c. In particular chapters are discussed the veracity, diligence, and judgment of Livy. We would advise every reader of Livy to peruse these Commentaries; and we recommend to a future editor of Livy to put them at the head of the text.

T. Livii Patavini Historiarum Libri qui supersunt omnes et deperditorum Fragmenta. Ex recensione Arn. Drakenborchii ad Codicum Bambergensis et Vindobonensis Fidem passim relictâ edidit JOAN. THEOPH. KREYSSIG. Editio Stereotypa. Lipsiæ, 1828. 4to.

The Vienna Codex, which has been used for this edition, is the same from which Grynæus published the last five books of Livy. The Cod. Bambergensis had already been collated by Goeller, (Liv. Pat. Histor. Liber tertius trigesimus auctius atque emendatus cum Fr. Jacobsii suisque notis ex Cod. Bamberg. edidit F. Goeller, Francof. 1822.) to whom Kreyssig communicated the various readings from l. xxxi.—

xxxviii. Crevier, Ruddimann, Ernesti, Lallemand, Stroth, Doering, Rupertii, and Lemare, may be considered as the most reputed editors of Livy since the time of Drakenborch; and Kreyssig, availing himself of the labors of all his predecessors, and having moreover the advantage of some additional excellent Codices which had never been carefully collated before, may fairly claim the merit of presenting us in his edition with the most correct text of Livy. We shall take this opportunity to give a list of the works concerning Livy which have of late years appeared in Germany.

1. Krusii Dissert. de fide Livii recte æstimanda. Lips. 1812.
2. Treckell's Anmerkungen über das erste und den Anfang des zweiten Buchs von Livius. Lips. 1817.
3. Walchii Emendationes Livianæ. Berol. 1815.
4. A. F. Lindavii Spicilegium Criticum in Thucyd. et Livium. Vra-tislav. 1817.
5. Büttneri Observationes Livianæ. Primislav. 1819.
6. Langii, et Lehnerii Emendationes Livianæ in Actis Philologorum Monacensium, Tom. iii. Fasc. i. ii.
7. Ph. Ed. Huschkii Diss. de privilegiis Feceniæ Hispalæ senatus-consulto concessis Liv. xxxix. 19. Götting. 1822.
8. Becker über Livius xxx. 25 und 29. Nazeburg, 1822; and Vorarbeiten zu einer Geschichte des zweiten Punischen Krieges. Altona, 1823.
9. L. Helleri Observationes Livianæ. Erlangæ, 1824.

Fr. C. Wolfii Observationes et Emendationes Livianæ, Parts i. ii. Flenopoli, 1826-27.

The present editor has included among the fragments that which was lately published from a Vatican Codex by Niebuhr, and which before him Brunsius and Juvenatius had discovered. After the *Varietas Lectionum* of Drakenborch's edition, an Index is given from the Bipontine.

Geschichte der Römischen Literatur, von D. J. CH. F. BAEHR. Carlsruhe, 1828.

This history recommends itself by a clear, comprehensive, and systematic account of the origin, progress, and decline of Roman literature. The plan of the work is more judicious than that which has been followed by Wolf, Harles, Fuhrmann, Dunlop, and other writers on the same subject. The Introduction treats in general of the origin and formation of the language of the different dialects, and gives a division of the language according to the different periods of its formation. The author assumes five periods:—1. From the foundation of Rome up to Livius Andronicus, 514 U. C.—2. From Livius Andronicus to Cicero, 648 U. C.; during which time the Greek literature exercised considerable influence on the language and literature of Rome.—3. From Cicero to the death of Augustus, during which time the Roman language attained its highest degree of perfection by means of the Greek models.—4. From the death of Augustus (anno Chr. 14.) to the reign of Antoninus Pius, an. 138 p. Chr.—5. From Antoninus Pius, to the conquest of Rome by Alaric, an. 410 p. Chr. Having taken this general survey, the author enters on the several branches of Roman

literature, pursuing each branch through all their different periods. We prefer this systematic plan to the chronological method which, having fixed certain periods, treats of all the different branches of literature during a particular period: a work written on the latter plan must necessarily be disjointed, and create confusion in the mind of the reader. The different branches of literature are treated of in the following order:—*Poetry*, with all its subdivisions into Tragedy, Comedy, Epic, Poetical, Narrative, Didactic Poetry, Satire, Lyric Poetry, Elegy, Bucolic Poetry, Fable, and Epigram.—*Prose*: The most ancient monuments (Fasti, Annales Pontificum, &c.), History, Eloquence, which comprehends Rhetoric, Novel, Epistolography, Philosophy, Mathematics, Architecture, Military Sciences, Geography, Agriculture, Medicine, Grammar, and Jurisprudence. In this way we obtain a clear view of all that has been done by the Romans in the several branches of literature, without losing the advantage of a general view of the different periods into which the whole of their literature has been divided. The author has kept a vigilant eye on the most recent researches in all the branches of literature; so that also in this respect his work must prove highly useful to the classical student.

Diogenis Laërtii de Vitis, Dogmatis, et Apophthegmatis clarorum Philosophorum libri decem. Græca emendatiora edidit, notatione emendationum, Latina Ambrosii interpretatione castigata, appendice critica, atque indicibus instruxit H. G. HUEBNERUS, Lipsiensis. Vol. I. Lipsiæ, 1828.

We need not say more in recommendation of this new edition of Diogenes Laërtius, than that the editor undertook his task by the advice and with the assistance of Professor Hermann at Leipzig. "Quotiescunque pulcrum aliquod sive non pulcrum Diogenis aliorumve carmen metris suis restituendum esset, toties (Hermannum) in consilium vocavi. Quod consilium quantum Diogeni profuerit, ut non est meum prædicare, ita singulæ prope hujus editionis plagulæ testantur." The editor has taken the text from the Geneva edition of 1616, having collated with it the editio princeps of Froben, Basil, 1533, and that of Pearson, which contains the Commentary of Menage. The conjectural emendations of Isaac Casaubonus and Menage are given under the text; but less use has been made of the conjectures of Meric Casaubonus and of Kühn. The Latin translation of Ambrosius, as given in the edition of H. Stephanus, has been improved on by means of that of Aldobrandini, and partly by the editor himself. The present volume contains only five books of Diog. Laërtius: we suppose there will be another volume for the text, and a third for the Commentary.

ΠΛΑΤΩΝΟΣ ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΟΝ.—*Platonis Convivium.* Recensuit et illustravit L. L. RUCKERT. Lipsiæ, 1829.

The editor has availed himself of the various readings of Bekker and of Stalbaum, and of two Codices besides. The Commentary discusses critical and grammatical difficulties; and we are happy to say that the editor has evinced discretion in this part of his task, in order to render his book useful to the teacher and to the student, rather than dazzling by the display of superabundant erudition. We consider as particularly valuable the 'Expositio Ueberior de Platonis

Convivio,' which treats of the Symposium in a philosophical point of view. It shows the connexion of ideas, and the general bearing of the original with reference to other works of Plato. Every φιλολάτρων must deplore that the writings of this great philosopher are so little attended to in schools, whence we perceive a general decline of taste for metaphysics; but without a luminous and condensed philosophical commentary, the reading of Plato is such an arduous task, that few masters and few students can do justice to it. The editor has much increased the utility of the book by frequent references to Hermann and Vigerus, and Matthiæ's Greek Grammar.

Kleine Historische und Philologische Schriften, von B. G. NIEBUHR. Erste Sammlung. Mit einer Landkarte und Inschrift-tafel. Bonn. 1828.

A volume of the smaller publications of Niebuhr has just been published. The principal jewel of this collection is the biography of his father, the celebrated traveller, Carsten Niebuhr. We have never read any biography with greater delight, or with a more intense feeling of veneration for the subject of the biography, or the biographer himself. From the contents of the remainder of the volume we beg to notice the following archæological dissertations:—On the age of Scylax of Caryanda; On the Geography of Herodotus; On the passages in Plautus, which are considered as spurious; Researches on the history of the Scythians, Getes, and Sarmatians; On the second book of the *Œconomica*; On the history of the growth and the decline of ancient Rome, and the restoration of the modern town; On the age of Lycophron. We have given a translation of the latter in a preceding number of the *Classical Journal*.

Bibliotheca Critica Nova. Edentibus J. BAKE, J. GEEL, H. A. HAMAKER, P. HOFMAN PEERLKAMP. Vol. II. Lugduni Batavorum, 1828.

This volume contains a variety of interesting articles. The following works are reviewed at considerable length:—pp. 1—20. *Quæstionum Scenicarum Specimen primum, quo Orationem indicit Meineke, Bero- lini, 1826*, by J. Geel;—pp. 21—39. *Initia philosophiæ Platoniciæ, auctore Ph. G. Van Heusde: Pars Prior, Traject. ad Rhenum, 1827*, by J. Bake;—pp. 40—61. *Delectus Epigrammatum Græcorum, quem novo ordine concinnavit, &c. F. Jacobs. Gothæ, 1826*, by Peerlkamp;—pp. 62—77. *Histoire de la Révolution d'Angleterre, par M. Guizot, by Thorbecke;—pp. 78—102. Ælii Aristidis Declamationes Leptinæ. Emen- datas, &c. edidit G. H. Grauert, Bonnæ, 1827*, by Geel;—pp. 103—143. *Lectiones Stobenses ad novissimam Florilegii editionem congestæ a F. Jacobs. Jenæ, 1827*, by Bake;—pp. 144—181. *De M. Pacuvii Dulo- reste: scripsit Henricus Stieglitz, Lipsiæ, 1826*, by Peerlkamp;—pp. 182—208. *Isocratis Panegyricus: edidit G. Dindorfius, Lipsiæ, 1826*; and *Isocratis Oratio de Pace: edidit P. L. Le Loup, Moguntiæ, 1826*, by Bergman;—pp. 209—245. *Theognidis reliquiæ: novo ordine dispo- suit, &c. F. T. Welcker. Francof. ad Mænum, 1826*, by Geel;—pp. 246—275. *Hellenische Alterthumskunde aus dem Gesichtspunkte des Staates von W. Wachsmuth, by Bake;—pp. 276—283. L. Cæcilii Minutiani Apuleii de Orthographia Fragmenta, et Apuleii minoris de Nota Aspirationis, et de Diphthongis libri duo. Edidit et animadver-*

sionibus auxit Frid. Osann, Darmstadii, 1826, by Peerlkamp;—pp. 284—293. Glossarium Livianum, sive Index Latinitatis, exquisitoris. Ex schedis A. G. Ernestii emendavit G. H. Schæfer. Auctius et emendatius edidit J. Th. Kreyssig, Lipsiæ, 1827, by Peerlkamp;—pp. 294—331. Geschichte des Osmannischen Reiches durch Joseph v. Hammer (History of the Osmanic Empire), by Hamaker;—pp. 332—371. Libri Wakedii de Mesopotamiæ expugnatæ historia pars e Codice Bibliothecæ Göttingensis Arabico edita et annotatione illustrata. Qua scriptio—ad orationem publicam audiendam invitat G. H. A. Ewald, Göttingæ, 1827, by Hamaker;—pp. 372—403. Ἰωάννου τοῦ Τζέζου Βιβλίον ἱστορικῆς τῆς διὰ στίχων πολιτικῶν, Ἄλφα δὲ καλουμένης. Textum recognovit, brevi annotatione, et indicibus instruxit Th. Kieplingius, Lipsiæ, 1826.

These elaborate articles are followed by several short notices (Relationes breviores) of works published either in Germany or in the Netherlands. The latter have never reached this country, we believe; we mention, for instance,—Joannis Chrysostomi Selecta, Gr. et Lat. De editionis novæ consilio præfatus est et annotationem subiecit Joannes van Voorst, vol. 1. Lugd. Bat. 1827; and, C. Cornelii Taciti de vita et moribus Cn. Julii Agricolæ Liber. Edidit et annot. illustravit P. Hofman Peerlkamp, Lugd. Bat. 1827. As a specimen of Peerlkamp's critical ingenuity we refer to the passage of Agricola, cap. 31. *Nos integri et indomiti et libertatem non in præsentiam laturi*. The reading in *præsentiam* is evidently corrupt; but the editors have not been able to find any remedy for it. But another reading of the Cod. Vat. (*libertatem non in penitentiam laturi*) led Peerlkamp to correct the passage by slightly altering the words *non in penitentiam* into *non impune tentatam*; a conjecture which carries conviction at once to the mind of the reader.

Ueber die Antigone und die Electra des Sophocles. Von G. A. HEIGL. Passau, 1828.

This work contains very interesting inquiries into the nature of the tragedies of Sophocles. The author contends that the principles of the Ionian philosophy may be traced in his dramas. But he labors to prove that we do not possess them, such as they were written by Sophocles; and he infers from the passage of the Scholiast ad Aristoph. Ran. v. 78. *κωμωδεῖται Ἰοφῶν . . . οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῷ ταῖς τοῦ πατρὸς τραγῳδαῖς ἐπιγράφεσθαι . . . ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ καὶ ψυχρὸς καὶ μακρὸς εἶναι*, that considerable additions were made to them by Iophon, and that he made them tedious and frigid. Also Quintilian, Orat. x. 1. 66, speaking of Æschylus, mentions the *correctas ejus fabulas*. He goes on to show that there were two parties at Athens; one which preferred the Sophoclean tragedies in their original state, as is reported of Æschines, *ἀναλαμβάνον . . . τὰς παλαιὰς τραγῳδίας* (x. Orat. Vit. Æschin.), and another which preferred them as they had been altered by Iophon; and that Lycurgus decided in favor of the latter party, even prohibiting the representation of them as they had been written by Sophocles, *οὐκ ἐξείναι γὰρ αὐτὰς ὑποκρίνεσθαι* (x. Orat. vit. Lycurg.). He calculates that a tetralogy contains about 5000 verses; and as three poets are known to have brought out their tetralogies on the same day, he thinks it must have been impossible to represent the tragedies in their present state. This will be fine amusement for the critics, who have been fancying all the while that they have made out the genuine text of the tragedian. Our author

proceeds boldly to analyse the *Antigone* and the *Electra* of Sophocles, and to show what belongs to Sophocles and what to Iophon; and he contrives by this process to restore the original tragedies: then he endeavors to explain how the residue contains the principles of the Ionian philosophy. With equal ingenuity our author endeavors to show what reference the *γραμματικὴ θεωρία* (Athenæ. x.) has to the tragedies of Sophocles and Iophon; and this part of the book is extremely curious, even after what Hermann has written on the subject. At the end of the book the discovery is made that this Iophon is precisely the same, *ὃς φασὶν εἶναι Εὐριπίδου Μήδειαν*, and whom Suidas calls Neophon. He played the same trick with Euripides as he did with his father. Iophon is charged with the death of Sophocles, who died, according to the satirical account of his biographer, from suffocation, in reciting a long sentence of *Antigone*, because the tragedy had become too tedious and frigid. Mr. Heigl extends his eccentric researches to a number of points connected with the ancient drama, and labors hard to prove that Aristotle understood nothing about it. As a curiosity his book is well worth perusing.

De Aristophanis Ranis Dissertatio. Scripsit A. G. BOHTZ. Gothæ, 1828.

The author endeavors to show that the *Ranæ* of Aristophanes were intended to expose the degeneracy of the poets of his age; and the degeneracy of the people in matters of taste; and that Euripides and Æschylus are only introduced, to draw a striking parallel between the poetry of his times and the ancient poetry, and to remind the people that they were themselves inferior to the *Μακροβρομύχοι* of Æschylus; and he conceives that Bacchus, with his sensuality and flippancy, dressed in the lion's skin and armed with the club, is merely a hit at the Athenians themselves. Aristophanes had therefore, in the *Ranæ*, the same object in view with regard to poetry, as he had in the *Nubes* with regard to philosophy.

Marci Annæi Lucani Pharsalia, cum notis C. Barthii, J. F. Christii, Gottl. Cortii, Joh. F. Gronovii, Nicol. Heinsii, J. A. Martyni-Lagunæ, Dan. Wilh. Trilleri, aliorumque. Editionem morte Cortii interruptam absolvit C. F. WEBER, Ph. Dr. et Gymn. Darmstadt. Professor. Vol. I, II. Lipsiæ, 1828-29.

A small edition of Lucan was published by Cortius in 1726. A larger one in two volumes, 4to., with a copious Commentary, was preparing for the press when Oudendorp's edition appeared in Holland. It put a stop to the large edition of Cortius; and he died before he could finish his Commentary. It extended however to eight books of the *Pharsalia*; and from the solid erudition of the author it was considered to be extremely valuable. Martyni-Laguna obtained possession of his papers (in 1785); and he devoted a number of years to Lucan, in order to complete the Commentary of Cortius, which he intended to publish, together with his own numerous annotations, as he declared in a letter to Heyne in 1795. A short time after a great number of his Ms. papers were destroyed by fire, and with them the Commentary of Cortius, as was generally supposed; the report of which was spread, or at least

countenanced, by Martyni-Laguna himself. However, he never published his intended edition of Lucan; and the present editor bought from the executors all the papers left by him. They were found to contain the whole Commentary of Cortius, besides valuable remarks on the Pharsalia by Martyni-Laguna himself. Thus Weber, who published himself an edition of Lucan in 1822, was enabled to publish another, which contains the Commentary of Cortius, &c. On a comparison of the first book with the edition of Cumberland, we should give decidedly the preference to the Leipzig edition. Even the print and paper may be called magnificent for a Leipzig edition. Not less than 79 Codd. Mss. besides inedited scholia, and all the editions that were of any value, have been collated and consulted for the present edition. The 'Dissertatio Editoris,' at the end of vol. ii. treats of the plan of the Pharsalia. The editor, in opposition to Jacobs, who gave it as his opinion that the Pharsalia would have ended with the death of Cæsar, if Lucan had lived to finish his poem, endeavors to show from internal evidence that it would have closed with the battle of Philippi. The hatred of Lucan against Nero, and his participation in a conspiracy against his life, lead us to adopt the view which Jacobs takes. Passages from the first three books prove nothing against it, because Lucan altered his whole plan whilst writing the poem. From a flatterer of Nero he became his mortal enemy. An Index Auctorum, Rerum, et Verborum, (pp. 691—694.) adds considerably to the value and utility of this edition.

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ ΤΑ ΣΩΖΟΜΕΝΑ.—*Aristotelis Rerumpublicarum Reliquiæ*. Collegit, illustravit, atque Prolegomena addidit C. F. NEUMANN. Heidelbergæ, 1827.

We take notice of this collection of the fragments of Aristotle's *Politeia*, not only because it was a desideratum, (cf. Casaubon. Not. ad Diog. Laërt. 76. ed. Col. 1615, and Niebuhr, *Histor. Rom.* i. 20.) but because the editor announces a far more important work, a 'Corpus Scriptorum rerum civilium,' which is intended to unite all the political fragments of the Greek writers, as, 'Αναξάρχου περί Βασιλείας, Αντισθένης Πολιτικός Λόγος ἡ Πολιτεία, Ἀριστοτέλους Νόμοι Πολιτικοὶ ἡ Πολιτεία, Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς περί Δημοκρατίας, Διοσκορίδου περί Νομίμων, Διογένης τοῦ Κυνικοῦ Πολιτεία, Ἐμπεδοκλέους Πολιτικά, Ἐπικούρου περί Βασιλείας, Ζήνωνος περί Πολιτείας, Ἡρακλείδου περί Πολιτειῶν, Θεοφράστου Πολιτικά, Θεοδέκτους, Κλεάνθου Πολιτικός, Κριτίου Πολιτεία Ἐμμετρος, Μενεσθένος Πολιτικά, Τηλεκλέους τοῦ Μιλησίου Πολιτεία, Φαλέου τοῦ Χαλκηδονίου περί τῆς Πολιτείας, Χρυσίππου περί Νόμων, Χρυσόγονου Πολιτεία, Ἀνωνύμου Πολιτεία, ap. Phot., &c. who are all mentioned by Athenæus, Plut. Diog. Laërt. and others. The fragments of Aristotle here collected refer to fifty-one cities, or nations, besides the *Βαρβάρων Νόμοι*, and the fragments 'Ex incertis Rebus publicis.'

Pausaniæ Græciæ Descriptio. Edidit, Græca emendavit, Latinam Amasæi interpretationem castigatam adjunxit, et Annotationem atque Indices adjecit CAROL. GODOF. SIEBELIS. Volumen quintum, Auctarium Adnotationum, Indices Rerum et Verborum, atque reliquas Bekkeri edit. Lectiones memorabiles continens. Lipsiæ, 1828.

This volume closes the edition of Pausanias by Siebelis. The 'Auc-

tarium Adnott.' contains some remarks on Leake's Topography of Athens. Siebelis observes, that *ἐν δεξιᾷ, ἐν ἀριστερᾷ*, does not always mean the right and left of the person, who is visiting the different places (cf. Leake, p. 177.) and he refers to viii. 38, 2, &c. In page 12. *Σκαμβωνίδαι* are mentioned, and Photius Lex. referred to: see also Boeckh's Corp. Inscript. vol. i. Fasc. 1. Inscript. 71. We would remind the editor, that Kruse's *Hellas* should be used with great caution; he indulges too much, like some critics, his conjectural faculties, and seems to forget that geography is a more stubborn thing than the text of an author.

M. Tullii Ciceronis Lælius. Recensuit, et Annotatione perpetua instruxit C. BEIER. Lips. 1828.

This edition is intended for schools. The critical apparatus of the editor consisted in seventeen Codices; among which was a Codex Bernensis of the twelfth century. From Gernhard's edition of *Lælius* he collected the readings of the Oxford Codices. In addition to the *Dialogus* is given—Excursus i. 'V. Th. Scheu de Morte Scipionis Africani Minoris ejusque auctoribus Dissertatio Historico-Critica,' which clears the family of the Gracchi from the suspicion, to which Cic. de Republ. vi. c. 10—26. "si impias propinquorum manus effugeris," had given rise; and Excursus ii. "de Formulis dubitanter decernendi."

L'Oraison Dominicale dans les Langues de l'Asie; with an inter-linear translation, by MATTHIAS NORBERG, Prof. at Lund.

Professor Norberg, one of the first Orientalists of the north, had conceived the project of comparing the Lord's Prayer in the various languages of Asia, as inserted in the work entitled *Mithridate*, by Adelung and Vater, Berlin, 1817. 4 vols. in 8vo. to show the affinity of all the languages of Asia with the Hebrew and Arabic. Some sheets of this work were printed when Norberg died; the Academy of Upsal has not continued the publication, but announces that the manuscript is deposited in its archives, where the public may consult it.

Thèse Critique sur la Langue Originale de l'Evangile de St. Matthieu. Par CHARLES GRAVITZ. 24 pages, in 8vo. Paris, 1827.

The object of this work is to determine in what language the Gospel of St. Matthew was originally written. The author thinks this Gospel was written evidently for the Jews of Palestine, at that period when the Hebrew was the vulgar tongue, for which he adduces proofs: he inquires how the original came to be lost in the first ages, without a copy having been preserved among the Judaising Christians, the Nazarenes, and the Ebionites; and he concludes that this Gospel, originally written in Hebrew by Matthew, was lost, and that there remains only a Greek translation of it, executed soon after the publication of the first. Although we acknowledge that the question is perhaps doubtful, yet we cannot agree with M. GravitZ, and will state one or two reasons:—1st, In whose hands perished this original Gospel of St. Matthew in Hebrew? In the hands of the Nazarenes, replies the author. But this Gospel of the Hebrews, which was vene-

rated by these sects, and which should be, according to the author, the original St. Matthew, is different from the Greek text which we possess; how then should our text be the translation of another text which differs from it? Our author replies, that the Ebionites corrupted the true St. Matthew; that is possible, but it is not supported on any kind of proof; the assertion is purely gratuitous. 2ndly, The author does not appear to have paid sufficient attention to the perfectly original characteristic style of our Greek Gospel of St. Matthew. In comparing Isaiah xlii. 2. and St. Matthew xii. 19. we perceive that the author of the Gospel according to St. Matthew translates not Isaiah according to the Septuagint, gives not a literal Greek translation of Isaiah, but modifies and accommodates passages to his purpose; never would a translator have acted thus; he would have purely translated it. What is altogether incredible is, that this translator, rendering into Greek a Hebrew verse of the Bible, should have given neither the verse of the Septuagint nor that of any other, but that he should have modified the quotation so as to be favorable to his own account: these considerations appear to us unanswerable. These researches of M. Gravitz appear to tend to this conclusion; viz. that St. Matthew might have written two Gospels, the one in Hebrew and the same in Greek, which is not improbable. (*Revue Protestante*, tom. 5. 3^e année, Juin, p. 284.)

ΤΟΥ ΣΟΦΙΣΤΑΤΟΥ ΝΙΚΗΦΟΡΟΥ ΒΛΕΜΜΥΔΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΣ.

Sapientissimi Nicephori Blemmydæ Oratio, Qualem oporteat esse regem. 24 pages in 4to. Romæ, 1827, typis Vaticanis.

This is a new present made to classical literature by M. Mai, who found the discourse of Nicephorus Blemmyda among the manuscripts of the Vatican, and has published it with a Latin translation.

Casp. Barthii Observationes ad D. Junii Juvenalis Scholia vetera, et ad aliquot Catulli, Tibulli, Ovidii, Calpurnii, Planti, Terentii locos, cum ejusdem auctoris adversariis commentariis a B. Spohnio repertis; nunc primum edidit FR. TIEDLER FIEDLER, Phil. Dr. in 8vo. of xix. and 235 pages. Price 1 rthlr. 4 gr. Leipzig, 1827, Manberger.

This work is only the forerunner of a great work of Barth, commented on by the late Professor Spohni, and which this last intended to publish.

Extrait de l'Atlas Historique, Généalogique, Chronologique, et Géographique, de A. LE SAGE (Comte de Las Casas); or Maps the most classical and most useful, &c. In folio, price 12 francs. Paris, 1828.

We owe thanks to the Comte de Las Casas for having detached this extract from his great work, which is so useful for the instruction of youth, and which has been so successful as to have already gone through eight editions.

Von der Form der Hebräischen Poesie, &c. On the construction of Hebrew Poetry, with a treatise on Hebrew Music; by SAAL-SCHUETZ. Price 3 thal. Königsberg, 1825. Unzer.

Several attempts have been made to determine the structure of the metre of Hebrew poetry, without any satisfactory result. The author of the work above announced has made new researches on this matter. After having examined in his introduction the four prevailing opinions relative to the question, whether the Hebrews followed a metrical system in their verses; a question frequently agitated since the epoch of the fathers of the church—the author passes on to a criticism of the works which may serve to confirm or reject the existence of a metrical system in Hebrew verse. It appears to be proved that the Hebrews have made use of three feet in the structure of their verse; the trochee, the spondee, and the dactyl.

Analecta Arabica, edidit, Latine vertit, et illustravit E. F. CAS.

ROSENMULLER (Zohairi Carmen Al-Moallakah appellatum).

In 4to. xviii. and 56 pages. Price 1 rthlr. 12 gr. Leipzig, 1826. Barth.

In 1792, M. Rosenmuller published a poem of Zohair, from a copy from the Ms. at Leyden, with the Scholiæ of Nachas, a Latin translation, and notices: this copy he procured from Rink. We now announce the same poem, after a copy made by the Arab, Michael Sebbagh, from the Ms. at Paris (1416), embellished with the Scholiæ of Zuzen: this edition is, moreover, enriched with an Arabic and Latin glossary, which explains all the words of this poem. This work is arranged chiefly for the use of young persons who study Arabian literature.

Auctarium Lexicorum Græcorum; præsertim Thesauri Lingux Græcæ ab H. Stephano conditi; editore F. OSANNO, Professore Jenensi. Insunt Anecdota tam Græca quam Latina permulta. In 4to. xviii. and 200 pages. Price 4 fl. 18 kr. Darmstadt, 1824. Leske.

A persevering study of many years has enabled the author to remedy in part the imperfections of our vocabularies, in collecting among the Greek classics all words which are not to be found in the dictionaries. This work is an excellent supplement to Greek lexicography.

Histoire Grecque traduite en Français du Grecque de Thucydide, avec supplement à son Histoire, in 5 vols.—containing, at the end of the translation, the geography of the historian, the plans of the battles described by him, numerous specimens of all the manuscripts, literary and critical observations, and a rich collection of plates by J. B. Gail, Conservator of the Manuscripts in the King's Library at Paris, &c.

This new translation of Thucydides into French is published by subscription: the 1st vol. is embellished with portraits of the three great historians, and was published about the end of 1828: the first four vols. are finished, and printed in 8vo. price 7 francs each. The complete atlas of Thucydides in 4to. with maps and plans (41 plates), numerous speci-

VOL. XXXIX. Cl. JI. NO. LXXVII. M

mens, and 22 prints, 25 fr.—The atlas alone, with the three maps of Greece, Sicily, and Lower Asia, by M. Lapie, and all the specimens, *but without the prints*, 10 fr.—The atlas complete, with portraits of the three great historians, Herodotus, Xenophon, and Thucydides, 114 plates, 60 fr.—The 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th vols. will appear from month to month.

Histoire Universelle de l'Antiquité, by F. C. SCHLOSSER, Professor at the University of Heidelburgh, translated from the German by M. Golbéry, Correspondent of the Institut, &c. Strasburg and Paris, 1828. 3 vols. in 8vo.

The first vol. of this work contains four sections: 1st, The Ante-Historic periods. 2nd, Primitive times, civilised states, China, and Japan, India, Bactriana, Egypt. 3rd, The period when the Israelites flourished, empire of the Medes and Persians. 4th, The period of the domination of the Greeks in the south-east part of Europe, containing the Peloponnesian war, and the reigns of the kings of Macedonia, Philip and Alexander, and concluding with the conquest of the Romans. History is not here to be understood in the rigor of the term; the author composes not a tissue of events, but a body of general observations on the manners, institutions, the progress of instruction and of civilisation among these ancient people.

Grammaire de la Langue Grecque, and of its various dialects, presented in an analytical order by M. A. GERFAUX. Paris, 1828. 4to. 96 pages.

First part, letters and signs, accents and punctuation; 2nd part, various parts of speech; 3rd part, system. The grammar is very concise, and is, for the most part, exhibited in tables.

Notice sur le Voyage Littéraire en Orient, de M. Schutz, and on the discoveries which he has recently made among the ruins of the city of Semiramis in Armenia, by M. SAINT MARTIN, read at the Academy of Inscriptions and at the Société Asiatique at its general and annual meeting, on the 29th April, 1828. Paris royal press, 30 pages in 8vo.

The celebrated Universal History, by EBN KHALIDUNE.

The object of M. Schutz's journey, under the auspices of the French government, is to collect works written in the ancient dialects of Persia, and particularly the books of Zoroaster: he is to sojourn in the southern provinces of Persia, where the followers of the law of Zoroaster are numerous. The war between the Russians and the Persians has, till lately, thrown impediments in the way of M. Schutz, and has occasioned his return to Constantinople, where he has made valuable literary discoveries in the various libraries of that city, the principal of which is the complete work or universal history of Ebn Khalidune: several extracts from this important work have already been published in the Journal Asiatique of France; and hopes are entertained that M. Schutz will ultimately be able to procure a copy of the manuscript, or the manuscript itself. M. Schutz has visited in Turkish-Armenia the remains of the city of Van, situated at the extremity of a lake of

the same name. This city is called by the Armenians *Schamiramahert*; that is to say, the city of Semiramis. The description of this city resembles what is given by the Greek authors respecting the monuments erected by order of Semiramis in Media and in Syria, and are truly magnificent. The Persian writers inform us, that Tamerlane, at the end of the 14th century, attempted to destroy these antique monuments, but the solidity and extent of them exhausted the vain efforts of his soldiers.

Moses of Khoren, an historian of Armenia, who wrote in the 5th century, and who had seen these magnificent monuments, describes the foundation of the town. The following is an abridged extract from his work. Moses, in describing the foundation of Van, reports that Semiramis, after having achieved the conquest of Armenia, was encamped with her army on the banks of this lake. Charmed with the enchanting aspect, with the mild temperature, the rich verdure, the abundance and quality of the waters of the country, she resolved to form there her royal summer residence: she chose a fine spot on the south-east shore of the lake gently inclined towards the north, and well watered. She caused forty-two thousand workmen to come from Assyria, who in their work were under the direction of six hundred architects and skilful artists in carving wood and stone, and in working iron and brass: they began by elevating an immense esplanade, formed with enormous masses of stone, and by a cement of lime and sand. This construction was rendered so solid, that it remained entire in the days of the Armenian historian above-mentioned; and it was then impossible to detach one stone from another, so tenacious was the cement: the stones were so smooth and so well polished, that they had lost nothing of their lustre. This esplanade, under which they had taken care to provide vast caverns (which in the time of Moses of Khoren served as a refuge to the robbers of the country), extended to the length of several furlongs to the place where was to be erected the foundation of the town intended to be built. This town was finished after the termination of some years, and was surrounded by strong walls, and ornamented with gates of brass. Several palaces were erected in stone of divers colors, covered with handsome terraces, to which were adjoined public edifices and baths in sufficient quantity. Canals distributed, in the different quarters of the town and in the gardens, the waters of the neighborhood; many country-houses and villas were erected to the right and left in various parts of the country. Plantations of fruit-trees as well as of vines were made, which attracted a great multitude of inhabitants. The Armenian historian says, that it is impossible to describe all the wonders of this magnificent city: he then resumes the description of the vast esplanade already spoken of. He says, after having surrounded it with the strongest defences, Semiramis caused the royal residences to be constructed, rendering the entry to them and the exit of difficult access: these palaces were entered only through frightful caverns. Moses of Khoren does not conceive how it was possible to construct all these edifices; but he adds, that *all these buildings are the most beautiful and the grandest monuments of kings*. The substance which forms the south side of the monuments is so extremely hard, that it is impossible to cut it with iron. Here are found temples, vast apartments appropriated to the secretion of treasure, immense vaults: a multitude of inscriptions are seen which of themselves are deserving of admiration. It would appear from the inscriptions on these stones

that the art of rendering them soft as wax had been known. Semiramis also caused columns to be elevated in memory of herself in divers parts of Armenia.

This description, which at first sight appears romantic, agrees nevertheless with the information received through the modern writers of Armenia; and it also agrees with that which they give of the antique monuments discovered at Van, and with the accounts which M. Schutz has collected respecting them.

M. Tullii Ciceronis de Divinatione et de Fato libri, cum omnium eruditorum annotationibus quas Johannis Davisii editio ultima habet; textum denuo ad fidem complurium codd. Msstorum, edd. vett. aliorumque adjumentorum recognovit, Friderici Creuzeri et Caroli Philippi Kaiseri suasque animadversiones edidit G. H. MOSER. Francof. ad Mœnum, Brœnner. 1828. in 8vo. xxvi. and 770 pages.

This edition comes recommended by the purity of the text, by a great variety of philological and historical notes, and by the care that has been taken to collect all the various readings, many of which were hitherto unknown. The short and learned remarks, with which M. Creuzer has enriched it, are such as will be very useful to such as are desirous of making a profound and serious study of these two works of Cicero. The treatise on Laws was published by the same editors in 1824. *M. Tullii Ciceronis de Legibus libri tres*, cum Adriani Turnebi commentario ejusdemque apologia et omnium eruditorum notis quas Johannis Davisii editio ultima habet; textum denuo recensuit suasque animadversiones adjecit G. H. Moser: accedunt copiæ criticæ ex codd. manuscriptis nondum antea collatis, itemque annotationes ineditæ P. Victorii, L. G. Grævii, D. Wytttenbachii, aliorum. Apparatum codicum et ineditorum congessit suasque notas addidit Fridericus Creuzer. Francofurti ad Mœnum, e typographio Brœnneriano, 1824, in 8vo. xxxii. and 798 pages (with a plate representing the territory of Arpino). The preface is by M. Creuzer, who, in speaking of the notes which are his own, expresses himself in these terms—"In quo ipse mihi hanc legem scripsi, ut quam maxime brevitati studerem, et sæpius in scriptorum locis laudandis me continerem."

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

SCHOOL AND COLLEGE GREEK CLASSICS, *with English Notes, Questions, &c.*—At the express desire of many eminent Schoolmasters, Mr. VALPY has commenced the publication of a SERIES of such of the GREEK AUTHORS as are chiefly read in the upper Classes of Schools and in Colleges. The best Texts are adopted, and the CRITICAL and EXPLANATORY NOTES are presented, it is presumed, in a more inviting and accessible form than those of Latin Commentators, by avoid-

ing that profuseness of annotation which frequently anticipates the ingenuity, supersedes the industry, and consequently retards rather than promotes the improvement, of the pupil. EXAMINATION QUESTIONS, adapted to the points discussed in the Notes, and INDEXES, are also added; and the Series, it is hoped, will constitute a convenient introduction to the niceties and elegancies of Greek Literature, and to the perusal of that portion of the relics of antiquity which is best calculated to interest a youthful mind.

Each volume will be sold separately; and it is intended that all shall be published in a cheap duodecimo form.

The following are already published:

EURIPIDES.—*Hecuba*. By the Rev. J. R. MAJOR, Master of Wisbech School, and of Trin. Coll. Camb. 5s.

————— *Medea*. By the Same. 5s.

SOPHOCLES.—*Cedipus Tyrannus*. By the Rev. J. BRASSE, D.D. late Fellow of Trin. Coll. Camb. 5s.

THUCYDIDES, HERODOTUS, XENOPHON, DEMOSTHENES, &c. will speedily be published in succession.

Also just published, to accompany Mr. VALPY's Greek Testament, pr. 2s. 6d. *The Doctrines of the Greek Article*, according to Bishop Middleton, Mr. Granville Sharpe, &c., briefly and compendiously explained, as applicable to the Criticism of the New Testament.

Stephens' Greek Thesaurus, No. XXXIX. containing the Index. Thus the Work is comprised in 39 Numbers; and though this last exceeds the size of three common Numbers, yet it is charged only as *one* to the regular Subscribers. In consequence, however, of its great extent, Mr. V. will feel himself at liberty to charge a higher price for it, when required to complete *imperfect sets*.

Many persons connected with *public* as well as *private* Libraries having declined to subscribe, until the whole work should be completed, they are now invited to make immediate application, as Mr. V. has not more than a dozen perfect copies in his possession, which may be had at 1*l.* 5s. per No. Small, and 2*l.* 12s. 6d. Large Paper. These copies may be had in sets, or in parts monthly, should such an arrangement best suit the purchaser. The price will soon be again raised. Those gentlemen who have *incomplete* copies are requested to perfect them, as the price has *already been raised* on such Nos. as are in arrear, and will from time to time be further advanced.

The Delphin and Variorum Classics, Nos. 121 to 124, containing the *Panegyrici Veteres* and part of *Aurelius Victor*.

Pr. 1l. 1s. per No.—Large paper, double. Present Subscription, 983.

As it may not be convenient to new Subscribers to purchase at once all the Nos. now published, Mr. Valpy will accommodate such by delivering one or two Nos. monthly, till the set is completed. Very few copies are left for disposal.

A new Edition of VALPY'S '*Delectus Lat. Sententiarum et Historiarum* ; ad usum Tironum accommodatus.' With Explanations and Directions: to which is added, a Dictionary of all the words which occur in the Delectus. Pr. 2s. 6d. 12mo.

The New Reader, consisting of Literary, Moral, and Historical Pieces, with spaces to mark artificial pauses. Pr. 3s. 6d. duod. A new Edition, enlarged.

Ancient Tachygraphy ; abridged from No. 96 of the *Edinburgh Review*.

We believe it is not generally known that there are many manuscripts in existence of great antiquity which are written in short-hand ; and it is from deciphering these that we hope to recover works that are not to be found at present in any other shape.

The story ordinarily received is, that the art was first practised by Tiro, the freedman, correspondent and favorite of Cicero. It seems more probable, however, that Tiro imported the art from Greece, than that he was the inventor of it ; especially as Diogenes Laertius informs us that Xenophon used to practise it.

Trithemius, or Tritthenheim, at the end of the fifteenth century, was lucky enough to purchase a lexicon of Tironian notes of an abbot of his own order.

After the time of Trithemius much was done at various periods and by different persons towards the analysis of the Tironian notes ; but not so much as the inquirer after the lost classics would desire, for no fruit was produced. The most important work on this curious subject is a very modern one ; and although it cannot as yet be said that the learned author has actually borne fruit, by deciphering any author of value, yet his labors will greatly facilitate such a generous enterprise ; and a brief account of the book will best explain what it is necessary to the present purpose to understand of these matters. The title of the work is, "*Tachygraphia Veterum exposita et illustrata ab Ulrico Frid. Kopp. 2 tom. 4to. Manheim, 1817.*"

The *first* volume contains various investigations ; the history of the art ; an analysis of the forms of words ; and whatever in short is necessary to constitute what may be called a grammar of ancient short-hand ; and it is, in truth, a wonderful monument of diligence and learning ; but it would be very advantageous to make an epitome or abridgment, omitting all that is merely archæolo-

gical and historical, and especially those parts in which the errors of others are stated and exposed, and retaining only whatever is necessary in a grammar.

The *second* volume is a very full dictionary of this old short-hand, containing about 12,000 words or marks, arranged in alphabetical order: a number abundantly sufficient to enable the student to become perfectly familiar with the whole system, and to put it in the power of any one, by the labor of a few hours, to discover the subject of any manuscript which is written in these characters.

A few Greek manuscripts are in existence written in notes; and the learned Kopp assures us, that the Greek notes are more easy and simple than the Tironian, and that the accents and spirits which are always expressed greatly assist the reader. In appearance they are more similar to modern short-hand.

This very industrious and learned person describes the manuscripts which he examined as consisting either of dictionaries of notes, which he found of course very useful, or works of a religious nature; and he very frankly gives vent to his disappointment in these words: "Vere dolemus, plurimos libros, qui notis Tironianis scripti in bibliothecis latent, non nisi psalteria, scripta de rebus sacris, opera patrum, aliaque hujus generis, continere, quæ cognoscere haud multum interest virorum doctorum."

IN THE PRESS.

Hoogveen on the Greek Particles; translated into English, and abridged for the Use of Schools, on the plan of *Viger's Greek Idioms*. By the Rev. J. SEAGER. Will speedily be published, price 8s. 6d.—It is the intention of the Editor to undertake, on the same plan, *Bos*, *Maittaire*, and *Hermann*; which will be published as soon as possible.

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Contents of the 'Journal des Savans' for October, 1828.

1. Geschichte des Kaiserthums von Trapezant, &c. c'est-à-dire, Histoire de l'Empire de Trébizonde, par J. Ph. Falmereyer, Professeur d'Histoire au Lycée Royal de Landshut en Bavière; ouvrage couronné par la Société Royale des Sciences à Copenhague. 4to. avec la devise, Fata canam, sed erunt qui me finxisse loquantur. [M. Hase.]

2. Religion der Babylonier, von D. Friedrich Münter, Bischof von Seeland, u. s. f.—Religion des Babyloniens, par le Dr. F. Münter, évêque de Selande, &c. &c. Copenhague, 140 pages, in 4to. [Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

3. Influence de l'Ecriture sur la Pensée et sur le Langage; ouvrage qui a partagé le prix fondé par Volney, par M. le Baron Massias. [M. Abel-Rémusat.]

4. Histoire Critique der Gnosticisme, et de son influence sur les sectes religieuses et philosophiques des six premiers siècles de l'Ere

Chrétienne; ouvrage couronné par l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, composé par M. Jacq. Matter. [M. Daunou.]

5. Mémoire sur la génération et le développement de l'embryon dans les végétaux phanérogames, par M. Adolphe Brogniart. [M. Tessier.]

Nouvelles Littéraires.

November.—1. Religion des Babyloniens, par le Dr. Fr. Münter. [2nd Art. of Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

2. Système de l'Edda et son Origine: ou Exposition des fables et opinions des anciens habitans du Nord, sur l'existence, la nature, et les destinées de la terre, des dieux, des esprits, et des hommes: comparé en détail tant avec le grand livre de la nature, qu'avec les systèmes mythologiques des Grecs, des Perses, des Indiens, et d'autres peuples anciens; et entremêlé de recherches historiques sur l'origine et les relations des nations les plus remarquables de l'ancien monde, &c. par Finn. Magnusen, professeur, &c. Ouvrage couronné par la Société Royale Danoise des Sciences. [M. Depping.]

3. Satires de Perse et de Sulpicia, traduites en vers Français, par M. F. Théry. [M. Raynouard.]

4. Histoire des Français des divers états, aux cinq. derniers siècles; par M. Amens-Alexis Monteil. [M. Daunou.]

5. Astronomie solaire d'Hipparque soumise à une critique rigoureuse, par M. J. B. P. Marcoz. [M. Letronne.]

6. Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. [3rd Art. of M. Abel-Rémusat.]

Nouvelles Littéraires.

December.—1. Introduction à l'étude des Vases Antiques d'Argile peints; par M. Dubois-Maisonneuve. [M. Raoul-Rochette.]

2. Grammaires Hébraïques, par MM. Lee, Ewald, et Sarchi. [Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

3. Examen Critique des Dictionnaires de la Langue Française, par M. Charles Nodier. [M. Raynouard.]

4. Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences de l'Institut de France, tomes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. [M. Chevreuil.]

SELECTION OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Homeri Odysseæ Rhapsodiæ sex, quibus Ulyssis errorum narratio absolvitur; in usum tironum, cum notis et indice grammaticam in primis vocum analysin atque explicationem exhibentibus. Edidit Josephus J'ejevsky. 8vo. Moscow, 1828.

Fragmenta Arabica, e codicibus manuscriptis Parisinis, nunc primum, publicis sumtibus, edidit D. R. Hinzius, a Cons. Aul. Petropoli. 8vo. 1828.

Arabic and Turkish Dictionary, printed at Constantinople in the year of the Hejra 1242 (1827), under the direction of Ebrahim Esaib, folio.

Histoire Générale de l'Inde Ancienne et Moderne, from the year 2000 before our Lord until the present time; preceded by a geographical notice and particular treatises on Chronology, Religion, Philosophy, Legislation, Literature, the Arts and Sciences,

and the Commerce of the Hindoos; by M. de Marlès, author of the History of the Domination of the Arabs in Spain, &c. 6 vols. 8vo. on fine paper; with a geographical map of India, 42 fr. Paris.

The 5th and 6th vols. of this important work, *recently published*, are not inferior in any respect to the four preceding volumes.

Dictionnaire Français-Arabe, par Ellious Boctor, an Egyptian, and late Professor of Vulgar Arabic at the Ecole Spéciale des LL. OO. Vivants at Paris; revised and enlarged by M. A. Caussin de Percival, Professor of Vulgar Arabic, &c. Paris. Dondey Dupré. 1828. 1st vol. A—KYS. 4to.

La Sainte Bible, en Hébreu, avec points. Printed by Plantin, Antwerp, 1566, 2 vols. Paris. Dondey Dupré.

This is a fine copy of the 1st edition of the Bible published by Plantin: it is embellished with various Hebrew notes, which appear to have been written by an Asiatic Jew, and which contain references from certain books to others. These notes form a kind of commentary.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We had prepared for this Number a Supplementary Article to our Notice of Mr. Cardwell's edition of the Nicomachean Ethics, which appeared in the *Classical Journal* for December last; from a wish to supply some omissions, as well as to correct some errors into which we had fallen: but the press of matter has compelled us to defer it till our next Number.

DR. ROUTH VINDICATED.

Sir,—Having been lately on a visit to Oxford, I took the opportunity of paying my respects to DR. ROUTH, the President of Magdalen College. After the usual salutation, this learned and excellent person entered immediately on a conversation relative to the several memoirs of DR. PARR, and his writings, lately published by Dr. Johnstone; and he expressed himself as surprised and hurt to find himself described by his learned friend, in some part of his works, as a *Jacobite*; a title which Dr. Routh utterly disclaims; and he wished me, as any opportunity might offer, to repel the imputation.

Now, Sir, as my *private* opportunities are very few, I have thought that some *public* channel for conveying Dr. Routh's wishes would be more direct and effectual; and I accordingly take the liberty of submitting what follows to the *Classical Journal*.

Those who were better acquainted with Dr. Parr than I was, well know that he was a *warm-hearted friend*, but that he was in the habit of speaking to his friends and of his friends in

VOL. XXXIX. Cl. II. NO. LXXVII. N

a sort of *serio-comical* way, in a style rather of banter and *point*, than in sober, serious earnest; and I infer that he was in some such frame of mind when he called his learned friend a Jacobite: not to mention the *absurdity* of deliberately and seriously calling a person a Jacobite at a time when the very title is altogether extinct, and no reason for using the word now remains. Still, as Dr. Routh is known as the head of a college distinguished for its attachment to the principles of the Revolution, and has himself published the improved edition of Bishop Burnet's History of his Own Times, he may not choose in any way to tarnish the character of his college, nor to have his own left under a charge of inconsistency. And, besides all this, Dr. Parr's insinuation relative to his learned friend may be considered as connected with some of his own, certainly not very respectful sentiments and expressions relative to his present Majesty, hardly consistent with the principles of one with whom it appears to be a leading rule (as he expressed himself to me) "not to speak evil of dignities;" Dr. Routh, therefore, does not consider himself responsible for any such-like matters which may occur in the writings of his late learned friend. After all, Dr. Routh did not mean to impugn any principles or sentiments avowed by Dr. Parr (these he left to speak for themselves), nor to charge him with any unkind intentions; but only with having spoken unguardedly of him, and certainly without any just reason or proper authority. Neither did he ascribe any illiberal motives to the respectable editor of Dr. Parr's works in retaining the objectionable passage alluded to. On the contrary, as the sheet containing it was sent to Oxford; as the doctor marked the part to be cancelled; as it appears that some cancel was made, and that notwithstanding the objectionable passage is retained; the retention of it, it should seem, must be ascribed rather to some mistake of the printer, than any oversight or any design of the editor.

I remain, Sir, yours,
VIATOR.

Original Letter of SIR WILLIAM JONES.

There is reason to believe that the following letter from Sir Wm. Jones has never appeared in print before its present publication: for a copy of it we must acknowledge our obligations to Lady Chambers, of Putney (widow of Sir Robert Chambers, late Chief Justice in Bengal). From the universality of his extraordinary acquirements, Sir Wm. Jones obtained and justly merited the title of "all-accomplished:" and among the various circumstances that chiefly contributed to acquire for him so ho-

norable a distinction, was his peculiar felicity in epistolary composition. For the proof of this assertion we may refer our readers to the numerous letters published by Lord Teignmouth in his interesting Memoirs of Sir William Jones's Life. The letter here given was addressed to "Mr. Joseph Fowke," who had lent to Sir William an Essay on Music: it is dated at the Court-house (in Calcutta), March 25, 1785.

"Dear Sir,

"I return your Essay on the Chronometer with sincere thanks for the pleasure it has given me. The business of the term which engages most of my time has been the cause of my keeping your work so long. It is written *con spirito*; but as I agree with you that English words are better than Italian, I would rather say (and I say it without compliment) that it is very animated. I am particularly pleased with the strictures on the scampering helter-skelter performance of those musicians, who, like some of our modern orators, mistake volubility for eloquence, and confusion for passion. Perhaps it is vanity that makes me relish your tract; for I cannot dissemble that I am pleased to find my taste confirmed by yours. I may, probably, be too fastidious; but in truth I can scarce hear an English concert with patience, much less with pleasure; and I have reason to believe, from the confession of Marranti, as well as from my own observation, that a just taste for true expression, natural simplicity, and distinct articulation, is declining even in Italy.

"I am, &c. &c.

"W. JONES."

[ADVERTISEMENTS.]

Just Published,

In 11 vols. 8vo. price 7*l.* 14*s.*; or, on Large Paper, royal 8vo., (of which only 150 copies are printed,) price 11*l.* 11*s.* in extra boards :

PLATONIS OPERA OMNIA;

Recensuit et Commentariis Scholiisque illustravit IMMANUEL BEKKERUS. Accedunt Virorum Doctorum Heindorf, Wyttenbach, Ast, Buttmann, Gottleber, Findeisen, Serrani, Routh, Stalbaum, Nitzsch, Heusde, Fischer, Boeckh, Lange, Nurnburger, Stutzmann, F. A. Wolf, aliorumque Annotationes textui subjectæ, Versio Latina, et Timæi Lexicon Vocum Platoniarum.

This beautiful edition has received the highest encomiums from the late Professor Dobree, and many other eminent British and Continental Scholars, and is the only *VARIORUM* one hitherto published: it contains the whole of the Greek Text, revised and amended from Manuscripts now first collated or used in any Edition of Plato; the Latin Translation of Ficinus; the Greek Scholia; the Annotations, either entire or select, of the different Commentators on the Text of Plato, or the Works attributed to him; a Reprint of the *Lexicon Platonicum*

of *Timæus*, as edited by Ruhnken: the whole preceded by Fischer's *Literary Notice of the Life and Writings of Plato*. Bekker's Text and Scholia are used, and such typographical errors are corrected, as had escaped that Editor's vigilance.

The spirited Projector of this fine Classic intended to publish it at 10*l.* 10*s.* for the Small, and 18*l.* 18*s.* for the Large Paper; but it is now (for the benefit of his Estate) offered at the above-mentioned reduced prices, by

JAMES DUNCAN, 37, Paternoster-row; Parker, Oxford; and Deighton, Cambridge.

*Just Published or Imported by TREUTTEL and Co.,
No. 30, Soho Square, London.*

T. LUCRETII CARI DE RERUM NATURA Libri VI.

Ad optimorum librorum fidem edidit, perpetuam Annotationem criticam et exegeticam adjecit A. FORBIGER. 12mo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

C. PASSOW, (DR.) ADNOTATIO CRITICA in ARISTOPHANIS NUBES. 12mo. 3*s.*

M. T. CICERONIS LÆLIUS, seu DE AMICITIA DIALOGUS. Recensuit, et Annotatione perpetua instruxit C. BEIER. 12mo. 3*s.*

————— In usum Scholarum, brevi Annotatione critica instruxit C. BEIER. 12mo. 2*s.*

HOMERI HYMNI, EPIGRAMMATA, FRAGMENTA, et BATRACHOMYOMACHIA. Ad optimarum editionum fidem recensuit, et Notis instruxit FR. FRANKE. 12mo.

CL. CLAUDIANI, ex editione Bipontina I. ad optimas lectiones, ut ad exemplar Burmannianum, nova Editio exacta; cum Notitia Literaria et Chronologico-Historica, necnon Indice Adnotationes explente. 8vo. Parisiis, 1829. 6*s.*

Q. HORATII FLACCI, ex edit. Bipont. II. ad optimas lectiones Mss. et Edd. nova Editio recensita, brevibus notis critic. et interp. subjunctis, necnon Horatiano Indice. 8vo. Parisiis, 1828. 6*s.*

Q. HORATII FLACCI OPERA OMNIA recensuit FILON. Editio nitidissima, dicta *Miniature Edition*, printed by Didot. Parisiis, 64mo. 1828. 8*s.*

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL;

Nº. LXXVIII.

JUNE, 1829.

ADDITIONAL NOTICE OF CARDWELL'S
NICOMACHEAN ETHICS.

ARISTOTELIS ETHICORUM NICOMACHEORUM LIBRI DECEM. *Ad codicum et veterum editionum fidem recognovit, varias lectiones adjecit, notis nonnunquam suis plerumque aliorum illustravit, indice denique uberiore ornavit* EDVARDUS CARDWELL, S.T.B. *Coll. Æn. Nas. Socius, necnon Historiarum Prælector Camdenianus.* Vol. i. Oxonii 1828. pp. xxviii. 310.

IN a former No.¹ of this Journal, we gave our readers an account of a new edition of the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle, which has lately been published at Oxford by Mr. Cardwell. In such quarterly criticism as ours, we find it sometimes impossible, on account of the shortness of the time at our disposal, to give that full consideration to single passages, and to examine a book with that scrupulous attention which we recommend to authors and editors. Accordingly, as *dies diem docet*, we have some corrections to make of inaccuracies into which we had then fallen, and some additions which we beg now to offer to our readers; the latter, indeed, chiefly consisting of discussions on two grammatical points, of some nicety and difficulty, and not devoid of interest to the verbal critic and scholar.

We proceed therefore, at once, to set down our remarks,

¹ No. LXXVI. p. 273—301.

premising only that for the 'sake of brevity we do not repeat what we have previously written, and must beg our readers to turn back to the notes referred to in our former article.

I. 6. 8. We now perceive that *οὖν* is omitted in several Mss. and in the scholiasts. Compare also II. 7. 16. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων καὶ ἄλλοθι καιρὸς ἔσται. Inf. § 16. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω. VII. 1. 4. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τῆς διαθέσεως τῆς τοιαύτης ὕστερον ποιητέον τινὰ μνείαν. Eth. Eud. I. 5. p. 83. 9. Sylb. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων ὕστερον ἐπισκεπτέον. Hist. An. I. 4. 2.

I. 6. 11. Ψιμυυθίω. Read Ψιμυθίω: on which form, see Dobree ad Aristoph. Plut. 1065.

I. 7. 13. Perhaps λείπεται δῆ.

I. 9. 3. v. 4. 5. VII. 7. 1. On these passages we shall say more in a detailed examination which we shall append to this article of the use of the particle *ἀν* before *εἰ*.

I. 9. 11. The following passage of Athenæus has been pointed out to us. IX. p. 393 D. ὁ τὰ Κεφαλίου ἐπιγραφόμενα Τρωϊκὰ συνθεῖς Ἡγησιάνναξ ὁ Ἀλεξανδρεύς. This example is decisive against our assertion generally, that Τρωϊκὰ never means an account of the Trojan war, (or rather of Trojan affairs. See Steph. Byz. in Ἀρίσβη.) Still, it should be observed, this is the usage of a late age and an *unclassical* country (if we may be excused such a word); and Aristotle himself elsewhere uses the word in the common limited sense (Metaph. IV. 11. p. 83. Sylb. πρότερον γὰρ τὰ Τρωϊκὰ τῶν Μηδικῶν). It should be remembered, that this is not a choice between the authority of Mss. and a conjectural emendation, but between the authority of *different* Mss. We admit that our argument derived from the former confusion of *T* and *H* in the Florence Ms. is considerably weakened by the occurrence of Τρωϊκοῖς in the Paris Ms.

III. 2. 17. On the use of *ἄρά γε* in an interrogative sense we shall offer some remarks, in correction and supplement of our former note, at the end of this article.

III. 5. 21. Compare also Mag. Mor. I. 35. p. 40. 4. λέγω δὲ ὡς *ἀν* ὁ λόγος ὁ ὁρθὸς καλεῖσθαι *ἀν* οὕτως ἔπραξεν. This is an additional exception to an observation which we made in our former number, that Aristotle never uses the double *ἀν*. See p. 286, note.

III. 8. 6. p. 281. 7 lines from the bottom, for "see through," read "have seen through."

III. 8. 16. III. 12. 7. On the last of these passages we were (as has been remarked to us) completely mistaken; and we must hope that our readers will charitably ascribe the fault to inad-

vertence rather than ignorance. The sense, as the words now stand, is perfectly clear. In the former passage ἢ may be rendered "than," "if they find out that it is otherwise than they suspect." We prefer very much ὑποπτεύουσι, as affording a better sense; "if they know it is not so, or even suspect it, they run away." We suppose that if we were to say that ὑποπτεύουσι had been corrupted by the termination of φεύγουσι, the advocates of the new reading would say that ὑποπτεύουσι had been corrupted by the termination of γινῶσιν, and therefore that this argument would not much avail us.

III. 10. 10. Thus in VII. 5. 2. for τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἣν λέγουσι, the Aldine edition has τὴν καλουμένην Λαμίαν περὶ τὸν Πόντον ἣν λέγουσι, &c.

v. 5. 3. The following proverbial hexameter is quoted:

εἰ κε πάθοι τά κ' ἔρεξε, δίκη κ' ἰθεῖα γένοιτο.

Zell's note on this verse is singularly luminous, "*γε deest in Par.*" p. 177. He probably means one of the three κέ's, but which we cannot guess. We venture, however, to propose, εἰ κε πάθοι τά γ' ἔρεξε, δίκη, &c. At least we do not see what can be the force of the second dubitative particle. And below in § 6. we would read ἀλλ' ἐν μὲν ταῖς κοινωνίαις ταῖς ἀλλαχτικάῃς συνέχει (scil. τοὺς πολίτας) τὸ δίκαιον τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς κατ' ἀνάλογίαν καὶ μὴ κατ' ἰσότητα. Commonly there is read before δίκαιον the word τοιοῦτον, which appears to be a gloss.

v. 7. 1. On νομικὸς and νόμιμος, see Schäfer ap. Naek. Chæril. p. 269. The reading of the Florence Ms. is however defended by the expression ἐπ' ἀνόρθωμα δικαίου νομίμου in v. 10. 3.—(In our former note for "p. 228," read "p. 458.")

VI. 7. 2. *Μαργίτης* is also read in Eustathius ad Od. κ'. 551. and Harpocration in v. cited by Tyrwhitt in the Index to the Poetics. Also in Polyb. XII. 25. 8. Dio Chrysost. p. 614 C. Photius in v. Bekk. Anecd. p. 279. 12. Proclus Chrestom. p. 468. Gaisf. &c. Clemens Alex. p. 121. Sylb. has *Μαργίτης*.—(In the note I. 5. for Ζέλεα read Ζέλεια.)

VI. 9. 6. οὐκοῦν οὐδ' ἐκείνη πω εὐβουλία, read οὐκ οὐκ οὐδ' ἐκείνη.

VII. 13. 2. On further consideration, we have no doubt that this passage is correct as it stands, and should be rendered thus: "*There is no reason why some one pleasure should not be better than all others, because particular pleasures are bad.*" It was not however necessary to read τὸ δὲ ἄριστον, as τᾶριστον δὲ is accurate: thus I. 5. 4. τὰγαθὸν δ' οἰκείον τι, &c. But in VII. 11. 5. for ὅτι οὐκ ἄριστον ἢ ἡδονή, ὅτι οὐ τέλος, ἀλλὰ γένεσις, we would without hesitation read: οὐ τᾶριστον: see the passages quoted in our former remark.

VIII. 6. 2. It has been suggested to us, that the proposed reading of ἀγαθὸν cannot be translated “and perhaps not even desirable,” as long as εἶναι continues in the text. We conceive that εἶναι is redundant, according to a well-known idiom: see Matthiæ Gr. Gr. § 282. Hermann ad Viger. Nos. 177, 178. Interpret. ad Soph. Œd. Col. 1191. p. 248. ed. Elmsl. (cf. Herod. iv. 33.) It is true that none of these grammarians allege an example from Aristotle; but we believe that the following one cannot be disallowed. Polit. p. 371 A. καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος εἶναι τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ πολιτεύματος, ἀνάγκη μὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλὰ τὸν νόμον εἶναι κύριον. If this should be disputed, we would read ἔσται; for the present reading seems to us not to agree with the context; and if in poetry it is true that *salus metri suprema lex*, so we say that in philosophy *salus argumenti suprema lex*.

VIII. 13. 10. For “ἀλάζων in iv. 7.” read “βάνουτος in iv. 2.”

IX. 7. 2. καὶν μηδὲν ὥσι χρήσιμοι μηδ' εἰς ὕστερον γένοιοντ' ἂν. If καὶν could here be considered as equivalent to καὶ εἰ ἂν, and the sentence be construed as if it stood, καὶν μηδὲν ὥσι χρήσιμοι καὶ εἰ εἰς ὕστερον μὴ γένοιοντ' ἂν, the present syntax could be defended. We have not, however, been able to find any example of such a resolution.¹ On the subject of ἂν and ἐάν, we may mention that Mr. Cardwell prefers ἐάν ὥσιν to ἂν ὥσιν, the reading of the Florence Ms. in x. 3. 2; but *vice versa* in v. 8. 2. For our own part, we should be inclined always to restore ἐάν, as we believe that the latest Attic inscriptions always observe that form, and being a conditional it frequently occurs in such documents.²

IX. 10. 2. πολλοῖς γὰρ ἀνθυπηρετεῖν ἐπίπονον, καὶ οὐχ ἱκανὸς ὁ βίος αὐτοῖς τοῦτο πράττειν. This is the common text: Mr. Cardwell reads αὐτὸ τοῦτο πράττειν, from the Florence Ms. We propose οὐχ ἱκανὸς ὁ βίος αὐτὸς τοῦτο πράττειν. Αὐτοῖς, at least, is clearly

¹ Arist. Poet. 46. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ, ἂν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τέχνην ἀδύνατα πεποιῆται, ἡμάρτηται. γὰρ ἂν in C. G. L. V. desunt. μὲν εἰ τὰ A. μὲν γὰρ τὰ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τέχνην εἰ ἀδύνατα B. One Ms. only has the common reading. (We quote from the last Oxford edition.) We would follow B. But if ἂν is retained, we must write πεποιῆται. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 198.

² Soph. Œd. T. 1062. θάρσει σὺ μὲν γὰρ, οὐδ' ἂν ἐκ τρίτης ἐγὼ ἢ μητρὸς φανῶ τρίδουλος, ἐκφανεί κακῇ. Here Dr. Elmsley received οὐδ' ἐάν τρίτης from a conjecture of Hermann; ἐάν having doubtless been corrupted into ἂν, and the preposition having been inserted to supply the wanting syllable. Hermann has since edited οὐδ' ἂν εἰ τρίτης: to which Dr. Elmsley properly objects that it would join ἂν with the future indicative.

wrong; nor do we see what would be the force of αὐτὸ τοῦτο, which would signify "this very thing."

x. 3. 6. With reference to our former note on this passage, it is proper, in justice to the learned editor, to remark, that ταῦτα τὰ πάθη might be made the subject, and the following might appear to be an instance of a similar arrangement of words: Plato de Rep. i. p. 351 C. μαυθάνω ὅτι σὸς οὗτος ἦν ὁ λόγος. It seems to us, however, that the cases are not in fact parallel; for Aristotle (if we mistake not) means to say, "*but these are bodily affections*," not "*but these affections are of the body*:" which sense (to correspond with Plato's collocation) should be thus expressed, σωματικὰ δὲ ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ πάθη: an arrangement *omni exceptione major*.

x. 5. 1. See Dobree ad Aristoph. Plut. 1084. and in § 6. διαφερουσῶν δὲ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν ἐπιεικεία καὶ φαυλότητι, καὶ τῶν μὲν αἶρετῶν οὐσῶν, τῶν δὲ φευκτῶν, τῶν δὲ οὐδετέρων, read οὐδέτερον, with the paraphrast, p. 494. ed. Oxon. We are unable to refer to the scholiast on this passage, there being no copy of the Greek commentators to this treatise in the British Museum. Compare Eth. Eud. i. 11. p. 110. ext.

x. 9. 18. ἀλλ' οἱ πολιτευόμενοι οἱ δόξαιεν ἂν δυνάμει τινὶ τοῦτο πράττειν καὶ ἐμπειρίᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ διανοίᾳ οὔτε [γὰρ] γράφοντες οὔτε λέγοντες περὶ τῶν τοιούτων φαίνονται, οὐδ' αὖ πολιτικούς πεποιηκότας τοὺς σφετέρους νιῖς. The particle enclosed in brackets (which seems to be a mere repetition of the first three letters of the next word) should clearly be expunged, as we indicated in our last number, when quoting this passage for the use of οὐδ' αὖ after οὔτε (p. 287, note). We confess, however, that the following lines of Euripides make us rather doubtful whether οὐτ' αὖ would not be more correct. Strabo viii. p. 366. τὴν δὲ Μεσσηνιακὴν (ρησί) καλλίκαρπον | Κατάρβρυτάν τε μυριοῖσι νάμασι | καὶ βοῦσι καὶ ποιμαῖσιν εὐβοτωτάτην, | οὐτ' ἐν πνοαῖσι χειμάτος δυσχείμερον | οὐτ' αὖ θεορίπποις ἡλίου θερμὴν ἄγαν. It may, however, make some difference, that in Euripides only one οὔτε precedes οὐτ' αὖ, while in Aristotle two precede οὐδ' αὖ.¹ Compare also ix. 10. 1. καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς φιλίας ἀρμόσει μήτ' ἄφιλον εἶναι, μήτ' αὖ πολύφιλον καθ' ὑπερβολήν.

¹ Eth. Nic. ix. 3. 3. ἐὰν δὲ γένηται μοχθηρὸς, ἀρ' ἔτι φιλητέον; ἢ οὐ δυνατόν, εἴπερ μὴ πᾶν φιλητὸν, ἀλλὰ τὰγαθόν; οὔτε δὲ φιλητέον πονηρὸν γὰρ οὐ χρὴ εἶναι: read either οὐδὲ δὲ φιλητέον or οὐ δὲ φιλητέον. Simonides Fragm. 230. v. 16. Γαῖσι παύσεις δ' ἂν μιν οὐτ' ἀπειλήσας ἀνὴρ, | οὐδ' εἰ χολωθείς ἐξαράξειεν λίθῳ | ὀδόντας, οὐδ' ἂν μειλίχως μυθεύμενος, | οὐδ' εἰ παρὰ ξείνοιον ἡμέτη τύχοι: read οὐτ' ἂν μειλίχως.

The following may also be added to our list of errata. 1. 1. 5. ἄλλο for ἄλλό. 1. 12. 3. ἡμᾶς. 11. 8. 1. εἰσιν. ib. 7. ἀνδρεία for ἀνδρεία. ib. 8. ἐσμέν for ἐσμέν. 11. 9. 2. εἰδότης. ib. 5. ἀπαγοντες for ἀπαγόντες. 111. 7. 2. τοῦτο for ταῦτο. v. 10. 8. ἐπεικῆς for ἐπεικῆς. v. 11. 2. εἰδῶς for εἰδῶς. vi. 12. 1. χεῖριμοί for χρήσιμοι. ib. 4. μηδετέρα for μηδ' ἐτέρα (see our former note on 11. 1. 2.). ib. 6. σκοπὸν for σκόπον. ib. 9. ἐστὶ. vi. 13. 3. τινὲς for τινες. vii. 3. 2. ἐστὶν. vii. 14. 6. κράσιν for κράσιν. viii. 2. 2. τὰγαθὸν for τὰγαθόν. viii. 3. 2. αὐταί for οὐταί. viii. 5. 2. πρεσβύται. viii. 6. 1. πρεσβύται. viii. 5. 3. φίλων. viii. 10. 1. δέ for δέ. ib. 5. ἀλλὰ. viii. 12. 3. φασί. viii. 13. 7. ἀλλὰ for ἄλλα. ib. 11. μέτρον ἐστὶν for μετρόν ἐστιν. viii. 14. 3. πολιτείας for πολιτείας. ix. 9. 2. μᾶλλον ἐστὶ for μᾶλλον ἐστὶ. ix. 11. 6. ἥδιον for ἥδιον. ix. 12. 2. ποτ' ἐστὶν for πότ' ἐστιν. ib. ζην. x. 4. 1. ἡδονήν for ἡδονήν. x. 8. 8. διατείνει for διατείναι.

I.—On the use of *ἂν* *εἰ* for *εἰ* *ἂν*, with the indicative, optative, and subjunctive moods.

In our former article on Mr. Cardwell's edition of the Nicomachean Ethics, we had occasion to examine three passages in which the construction severally was, *κἂν εἴ ἐστιν*, *κἂν εἰ εἴη*, and *κἂν εἰ ᾗ*. The first and second of these appeared to us to contain a double solecism; viz. the intrusion of *εἰ* after *ἂν*, and the use of an infinitive or optative after *ἂν*. Accordingly, we suggested an alteration in both places; and in correcting the third, we were supported by the authority of Mr. Hermann, whose words we alleged. We likewise adduced a few examples which seemed to labor under the same disease; but on a further examination of the point we have found a greater number of refractory passages than we then anticipated; and as Mr. Hermann, in his admirable and comprehensive treatise on the particle *ἂν*, has not entered into this question, we will endeavor at least to lay before the reader some data for deciding it, if we should fail in proving our own opinion to his satisfaction.

The question which we wish to determine is, whether *ἂν* *εἰ* can be used for *εἰ* *ἂν*; and if so, whether it may be used indifferently with either the indicative, optative, or subjunctive moods. For instance, whether the following sentence, "it appears, even though it is the gift of inspiration, to be in its nature divine," can be correctly rendered in either of the following manners: φαίνεται δὲ, *κἂν εἰ μὴ θεόπεμπτός ἐστι*, τῶν θειοτάτων εἶναι: φ. δὲ, *κἂν εἰ μὴ θεόπεμπτος εἴη*, τῶν, &c.: φ. δὲ, *κἂν εἰ μὴ θεόπεμπτος ᾗ*, τῶν, &c.

Now, in the first place, we must begin by excluding all those passages in which the particle *ἄν* refers to some verb, either subsequent or understood: to which class of cases Matthiæ's observation applies, that "*καὶ εἰ* is used (*always with the indicative or optative*¹) when the *ἄν* refers to a verb omitted, but easily supplied in the apodosis to *εἰ*." Gr. Gr. § 621.

1. Soph. Ant. 465.

οὕτως ἔμοιγε τοῦδ' τοῦ μόρου τυχεῖν
παρ' οὐδὲν ἄλγος· ἀλλ' ἄν, εἰ τὸν ἐξ ἐμῆς
μητρὸς θανόντ' ἄθρακτον ἐσχόμην νέκυν,
κείνοις ἄν ἤλγουν.

This passage is correctly explained by Hermann de Particula *ἄν* ad fin. as follows: "*ἀλλ' ἄν elliptice dixit pro ἀλλ' ἦν ἄν ἄλγος, sed eam ellipsin deinde explet additis κείνοις ἄν ἤλγουν.*" Perhaps, however, it is more simple to say, that Sophocles made use of the liberty of using the double *ἄν*, in order to warn the reader of the latter clause of the sentence.—See Whately's *Rhetoric*, p. 255.

2. Aristoph. Ran. 585.

καὶ, εἰ με τύποις, οὐκ ἄν ἀντείποιμί σοι.

Here the first *ἄν* serves exactly the same purpose as that just pointed out, and does not (as has been supposed) belong to *τύποις*.

3. Aristoph. Nub. 106.

- A. ἀλλ' εἴ τι κῆδει τῶν πατρῶων ἀλφίταν
τούτων γενοῦ μοι, σχασάμενος τὴν ἵππικὴν.
B. οὐκ ἄν μὰ τὸν Διόνυσον, εἰ δολίης γέ μοι
τοὺς φασιανοὺς οὕς τρέφει Λεωγόρας.

That is, οὐκ ἄν γενοίμην, "I will not."

4. On the following fragment of Lysias nothing can be decided, as we have not the full text of the author; but perhaps the end of the sentence is wanting, or a verb should be supplied from what preceded, so that it falls under the above head. Lysias ap. Harpocrat. Phot. et Suid. in *ὑβολουστατεῖ*· οὐδ' ἄν εἰ πολλὸν (οἱ πολλοί, Phot.) ἐλάττονα τόκον λογίσαιτό τις ἢ ὅσον οὗτοι ὑβολουστατοῦντες τοὺς ἄλλους πράττονται.

5. Plato Protag. p. 328 A. εἶθ' ὥσπερ *αν* εἰ ζητοῖς τίς διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἐλληνίζειν, οὐδ' ἄν εἰς φανείῃ. We are doubtful whether

¹ This limitation Matthiæ has borrowed from Stalbaum (as we shall see presently), and applied it incorrectly. Stalbaum meant that when *ἄν* *εἰ* was used for *εἰ ἄν* (both particles applying to the same verb), it always governed one of the moods stated.

the first *άν* can be here supposed to make ready the way for the second; if not, it should in our opinion be expunged.

6. Plat. Apol. Socrat. p. 18 A. ὥσπερ οὖν *άν*, εἰ τῷ ὄντι ξένος ἐτύγχανον *άν*, ξυνογιγνώσκατε δήπου *άν* μοι.

Here again the force of *άν* is quite evident.

7. Demosth. in Euerg. et Mnesib. p. 1159. 14. (quoted by Hermann as above) Καίτοι πῶς *άν*, εἰ μὴ πεπορισμένον τε ἦν καὶ ἐπηγγέλκειν αὐτοῖς, εὐθύς *άν* ἀπέλαβον. Here again the same remark applies.

8. Demosth. in Mid. p. 530. 21. εἰ μὲν τοίνυν μὴ χορηγὸς ὦν ταῦτ' ἐπεπόνθειν ὑπὸ Μαιδίου, ὕβριν *άν* τις μόνον κατέγνω τῶν πεπραγμένων αὐτῷ· νῦν δέ μοι δοκεῖ *κάν* ἀσέβειαν εἰ καταγιγνώσκει τὰ προσήκοντα ποιεῖν, i. e. *κάν* ποιεῖν τὰ προσήκοντα ἀσέβειαν εἰ καταγιγνώσκει.

We now proceed to those cases in which the *άν* and the *εἰ* both refer to the same verb. And we will set down two notes of Mr. Stalbaum, a commentator on Plato, who has proposed a definite rule on this point.

Stalbaum ad Plat. Phileb. § 137. p. 192. “*Κάν* ἢ *σμικρά* καὶ *σμικρά* *δύνασκα*. Ald. Bas. 1. 2. Stephan. al. *κάν* εἰ *σμικρά* καὶ *σμικρά* *δύνασκα*. Recte jam Ficinus, ‘quamvis parva sit ac minime utilis.’ Quare Cornarius bene μὴ extingui jussit et εἰ post *κάν* mutari in ἢ. Temere Fischerus εἰ ita defendit, ut *κάν* εἰ *σμικρά* etiam simpliciter dictum recte habere contendat. *Vellem sane vel unum e bonæ notæ scriptoribus hujusmodi exemplum nobis ostendisset.*”

Ib. p. 193. “*Κάν* εἰ *σμικρόν*, καθαρὸν δὲ εἶη, ‘etiāmsi parva sit, modo pura.’ *Κάν* εἰ *semper jungitur aut indicativo aut optativo, nunquam conjunctivo*. Cf. Phædon. p. 71 B. Lysid. p. 209 E. Alcibiad. 1. p. 35. Theag. p. 130 D. de Repub. 11. p. 376 A. ubi scribendum *κάν* εἰ—*πέπονθοι* (sic). Vulgo εἰ deest Aristoph. Ran. 585. ubi recte habet *κάν* εἰ γε τύπτοις μ’, οὐκ *άν* ἀντείποιμί σοι, quanquam non probem Brunckii rationes, quibus nonnullorum codd. lectionem *κάν* εἰ γε τύπτοις rejicit. Cf. ejus not. ad Plut. 1037.”

Two rules are here laid down: 1. that *άν* εἰ is never used without a verb; 2. that *άν* εἰ for εἰ *άν* is always joined with an indicative or optative, and never with a subjunctive.

In order to examine the accuracy of these canons, we will transcribe all the examples of the construction in question with which we are acquainted, and divide them into four classes; viz. 1. when *άν* εἰ is used with the subjunctive; 2. the optative; 3. the indicative; and 4. with no verb at all.

The only notice which Mr. Hermann takes of this use of *ἐν* in his essay on that particle is, in treating of the construction of *εἰ* with the subjunctive mood, when he uses the following words: "*Sæpe sic, maxime apud Aristotelem, εἰ prægresso ἐν, ut de Somno et Vigil. p. 685 A. καὶ εἰ τοῦτο γένηται. De Rep. 11. 1. p. 312 C. καὶ εἴ τινες ἔτεροι τυγχάνωσιν εἰρημέναι. 11. 2. p. 313 C. ὥσπερ ἐν εἰ σταθμὸς πλείον ἐλκύσῃ.*" 11. 7.¹ Here then we have a direct contradiction to the second rule cited above; and this from an author of a most learned dissertation on the particle *ἐν*, who does not even mention the practice which Mr. Stalbaum says is invariable! On the other hand, Mr. Hermann is at variance with himself. For in a note on Viger, quoted by us in p. 290, he says of a passage in Aristotle, *καὶ εἰ μάλιστα καὶ ἐλάττους φαίνωνται, Aristoteles scripserit necesse est καὶ μείζους, omisso εἰ.* We have no doubt that this latter opinion is correct: that in such cases *καὶ* is *καὶ ἐν*, and not *καὶ ἐν*, and consequently that *εἰ* is an intruder. To the passages quoted in the note referred to, we beg to add the following.²

1. Plat. Phædon. p. 71 B. οὐκ οὖν καὶ διακρίνεσθαι καὶ ξυγκρίνεσθαι καὶ ψύχεσθαι καὶ θερμαίνεσθαι καὶ πάντα οὕτω, καὶ εἰ μὴ χρώμεθα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐνιαχοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔργῳ γοῦν πανταχοῦ οὕτως ἔχειν ἀναγκαῖον, &c. Here *χρώμεθα* may be either the indicative or subjunctive; and by writing *χρώμεθα*, the optative. We should,

¹ The following passage would perhaps have better suited Mr. Hermann's purpose: Aristot. Rhet. II. 23. 27. ὅσον βροτοὶν ἑλεῖται φροτῶσιν, εἰ θύωσι τῇ λευκοθέῃ καὶ θρηνώσιν ἢ μὴ, συνεβούλευεν, &c.

² The reading *καὶν* *ρέπωσι* proposed by us in Eth. Nic. VII. 7. 1. is stated by Camerarius to be "*in veteribus libris, quibus* (says Zell, p. 283.) *haud dubie suum codicem significat; nam alibi hanc lectionem nondum reperire potui.*" Now, although the early scholars used the words *veteres libri, codices*, &c. in a very vague sense, it is certain in this case that Camerarius had in his possession a Ms. of these Ethics. In the title-page of his Commentary it is stated, that "*textus non modo, &c. sed etiam multis in locis ex studiosa diversarum editionum et veteris libri manuscripti collatione emendatur.*" Readings are quoted from a *vetus liber* which do not appear in any edition. Thus on VIII. 3. 4. he says, (p. 377.) "*in veteri libro reperio ἐὰν δὴ ὠφέλιμοι.*" And again, p. 378. on VIII. 3. 7. "*mox deinde ταύτην γὰρ ὁμοία καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ; hæc igitur in veteri libro sic exarata reperimus, ταύτην γὰρ ὁμοία καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, τό, τε ἀπλῶς ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἥδ' ἀπλῶς. ἐστὶ μάλιστα δὴ ταῦτα φιλητά.*" Neither of these varieties are of any value; but they prove incontestably that Camerarius used a Ms., unless (for which we know no reason) his good faith is questioned. The reading *καὶν* *ρέπωσι* may therefore be considered as resting on manuscript authority; and we prefer it very much to *καὶ εἰ* *ρέπωσι*, which might be conjectured on the authority of the Florence Ms. which has *καὶν* *εἰ* *ρέπουνσι*.

however, venture to consider it as the subjunctive, and read *κάν* *μη* *χρώμεθα*.

2. Id. Rep. p. 579 E. ἔστιν ἄρα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, *κάν* εἰ *μη* τῷ δοκῇ, ὁ τῷ ὄντι τύραννος τῷ ὄντι δοῦλος. This passage Mr. Stallbaum prudently omits. Read *κάν* *μη* τῷ δοκῇ. Thus in Theag. p. 121 A. *κάν* ἢ ἀσχολία even the Bodleian Ms. has *κάν* εἰ. Compare Aristot. Eth. Eud. vii. 2. p. 187. 20. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ δοκεῖ, τοῖς δὲ φαίνεται *κάν* *μη* δοκῇ.

3. Aristot. Polit. p. 312 C. ed. Duval. δεῖ τὰς ἄλλας ἐπισκέψασθαι πολιτείας αἷς τε χρῶνται τινες τῶν πόλεων τῶν εὐνομεῖσθαι λεγομένων, *κάν* εἰ τινες ἕτεροι τυγχάνωσιν ὑπὸ τινων εἰρημέναι καὶ δοκοῦσαι καλῶς ἔχων.

Perhaps καὶ εἰ τινες ἕτεροι τυγχάνουσιν.

4. Ib. p. 313 C. βοηθίας γὰρ χάριν ἢ συμμαχία πέφυκεν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ σταθμὸς πλεῖον ἐλκύσῃ.

We would read ὥσπερ εἰ σταθμὸς πλεῖον ἐλκύσαι.

5. Ib. p. 347 A. ὁμοίως δὲ πάλιν *κάν* εἰ που συμβαίῃ τοὺς ἀπόρους ἐλάττους μὲν εἶναι τῶν εὐπόρων, &c.

Sylburg proposes συμβαίῃ, Schneider and Coraës συμβαίνοι. Perhaps πάλιν εἰ που συμβαίῃ. Compare Eth. Nic. v. 11. 8. καὶ τοὶ γίνονται ἂν ποτε θάτερον κατὰ συμβεβηκός, εἰ προσπαίσαντα διὰ τὸ πεσεῖν συμβαίῃ ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ληφθῆναι.

6. Id. Eth. Eud. vii. 10. p. 206. 5. Sylb. ἐπεὶ *κάν* εἰ μεγάλα παθὼν *μη* ἀποδῶ ἢ δι' ἀδυναμίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἰδύνατο, καλῶς.

We propose ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰ μεγάλα παθὼν *μη* ἀποδῶ (or ἀποδοίῃ) δι' ἀδυναμίαν, &c.

7. Aristot. Metaph. ii. 1. p. 32. Sylb. ταῦτα δ' ἔστιν ὅσα τε περὶ αὐτῶν ἄλλως ὑπειλήφασί τινες, *κάν* εἰ τι χωρὶς τούτων τυγχάνῃ παρεωραμένον.

Read either *κάν* τι χωρὶς τούτων, or (which we prefer) καὶ εἰ τι χωρὶς τούτων τυγχάνοι.

Besides these seven instances of the subjunctive mood, there are four noticed in our former remark in p. 290; one of which is corrected by Mr. Hermann, and another is adduced by the same critic from the treatise *De Somno*, in which likewise the particle *ἂν* should be omitted.

With the Optative.

1. Plat. Theag. p. 130 D. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔμαθον παρὰ σοῦ οὐδὲν πάποτε, ὡς αὐτὸς οἶσθα· ἐπιδίδου δὲ ὁπότε σοι ξυνείῃ, *κάν* εἰ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ μόνον οἰκία εἴην, *μη* ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ δὲ οἰκήματι.

2. Id. Lysid. p. 209 E. καὶ τὸν μὲν οὐδ' ἂν σμικρὸν ἰάσειεν ἐμβαλεῖν, ἡμᾶς δὲ, *κάν* εἰ βουλοίμεθα δραξάμενοι τῶν αἰῶν, ἐφ' ἃν ἐμβαλεῖν.

In both these passages we would read *καὶ εἰ*.

3. Id. Phileb. p. 58 C. *κἂν εἰ σμικρὸν, καθαρὸν δὲ εἴη*.

At the danger of incurring Mr. Stalbaum's utmost wrath, we venture to doubt the soundness of this passage. The Bodleian Ms. has *καθαρὸν δεῖη*. We would omit *εἰ*, and transposing the last letters, read *κἂν σμικρὸν καθαρὸν δὲ ἦ*.

4. Id. Rep. p. 376 A. *ὃν μὲν ἂν ἴδῃ ἀγνώστα χαλεπαίνει, οὐδὲν δὲ κακὸν προπεπονθώς· ὃν δ' ἂν γινώριμον ἀσπάζεται, κἂν μηδὲν πώποτε ἰπ' αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὸν πεπόνθοι*.

Here Mr. Stalbaum proposes *κἂν εἰ μηδὲν . . . πεπόνθοι*. We read without hesitation *πεπόνθοι*.

5. Id. Protag. p. 328 B. *ἀλλὰ κἂν εἰ ὀλίγον ἐστὶ τις ὅστις διαφέρει ἡμῶν προβιάσαι εἰς ἀρετὴν, ἀγαπητόν*.

Here we would read *καὶ* for *κἂν*.

6. Id. Apol. p. 27 A. *ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ εἴποι, "ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἀλλὰ θεοὺς νομίζων."*

Here Matthiæ (Gr. Gr. § 599. 4. note) defends *ἂν*, on the principle that it "belongs not to *εἴποι*, but to the optative which follows, or which is to be supplied from what goes before." He also thinks that in later times *ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ* was a compound form, in which neither *ἂν* nor *εἰ* had any influence on the construction: and he quotes a passage from Demosthenes on the Crown, p. 299. 20. where *ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ* is used for *ὥσπερ*. We must say that we have great doubts that Demosthenes would have used the particle *ἂν* as a mere expletive; but in the passage of Plato, we would certainly read *ὥσπερ εἰ εἴποι*, the *ἂν* being written above the line in the Bodleian Ms.

7. Id. Protag. p. 344 A. *ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ θείημεν αὐτὸν λέγοντα τὸν Πιττακόν*

8. Ib. p. 344 C. *λέγει γὰρ μετὰ τοῦτο διελθὼν, ὡς ἂν εἰ λόγῳ λόγον ὅτι γενέσθαι μὲν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν χαλεπὸν ἀληθείας*.

Read *ὥσπερ εἰ* and *ὡς εἰ*.

9. Aristot. Poet. 3. (p. 4. 1. ed. Oxon. 1817.) *ὁμοίως δὲ, κἂν εἴ τις ἅπαντα τὰ μέτρα μιγνύων ποιοῖτο τὴν μίμησιν (ὥσπερ Χαιρήμων ἐποίησε Κένταυρον ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν μέτρων), οὐκ ἦδη καὶ ποιητὴν προσαγορευτέον*.

Read from the Venice Ms. *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ, εἴ τις ἅπαντα, &c.*

10. Id. Polit. p. 299 B. *πρῶτον δὲ περὶ δεσπότου καὶ δούλου εἵπαμεν, ἵνα τὰ τε πρὸς τὴν ἀναγκαίαν χρείαν ἴδωμεν, κἂν εἴ τι πρὸς τὸ εἰδέναι περὶ αὐτῶν δυναίμεθα λαβεῖν βέλτιον τῶν νῦν ὑπολαμβάνομένων*.

Here we would make the same alteration.

11. Ib. p. 355 E. *παραπλήσιον γὰρ κἂν εἰ τοῦ Διὸς ἀρχεῖν ἀξιοῖεν*.

Read καὶ εἰ, though we should prefer καὶ τοῦ Διδος ἀρχεῖν ἀξιῶσιν.

12. Ib. p. 431 D. ἔτι δὲ τῆς περὶ ξύλα ὕλης, καὶ εἴ τινα ἄλλην ἐργασίαν ἢ χώρα τυγχάνοι κεκτημένη τοιαύτην, εὐπαρακόμιστον.

Here also for καὶν read καὶ, and compare the 7th example of the subjunctive mood.

13. Id. Metaph. i. 3. p. 7. Sylb. ἦν τε γὰρ μάλιστ' ἂν ὁ Θεὸς ἔχοι, θεία τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ἐστὶ, καὶν εἴ τις τῶν θείων εἴη.

Here perhaps should be read καὶν τις τῶν θείων ἦ, as in the next passage.

14. Eth. Nic. v. 4. 5. λέγεται γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις, καὶν εἰ μὴ τισιν οἰκείον ὄνομα εἴη, τὸ κέρδος. Here the Florence Ms. has ἦ for εἴη; and the same form is printed in the parallel passage of the Eudemean Ethics iv. 2. p. 134. 24. Sylb. Read therefore καὶν μὴ τισιν οἰκείον ὄνομα ἦ.

15. Ib. v. 9. 13. ὥσπερ οὖν καὶν εἴ τις μερίσταιτο τοῦ ἀδικήματος. Here Mr. Cardwell has properly restored καὶ εἴ τις from the Florence Ms. and the Basle edition has the same reading in Eth. Eud. iv. 7. p. 145. 3. We observe, generally, that this edition in those parts of the Eudemean Ethics which are repeated in the Nicomachean, in the former agrees with the Florence Ms. of the latter.

16. Ib. vi. 13. 8. ἔτι ὅμοιον καὶν εἴ τις τὴν πολιτικὴν φαίη ἀρχεῖν τῶν θεῶν, ὅτι ἐπιτάττει περὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ πόλει.

We would read either καὶ εἰ or ὅμοιον εἴ τις.

17. Eth. Eudem. iii. 4. p. 121. 18. οὐ μὲν τοι οὕτως ὡς ἂν εἴ τις σταθμῶ χρήσαιτο τῷ ὑποδήματι, ἀλλ' οἷον ἢ πώλησις καὶ ἢ μίσθωσις.

Read ὡς εἴ τις.

18. Ib. vii. 15. p. 219. 19. τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὴν τροφὴν εἴπειεν ὡς ἡ ἱατρικὴ καὶ ὁ λόγος ταύτης.

Here also we would omit ἂν. To reconcile the reader with these numerous omissions of ἂν we will refer him to the words of Dindorf ad Xenoph. Hipparch. i. 15. "*Pro καὶν legendum ἂν vel ἐὰν, delendum autem est ἂν. Hujus quidem quavis pagina exempla præbet vel additi temere vel omissi.*" And thus in vi. 6. for καὶν he read καί. On the confusion of καὶν and καί, see also Elmsley ad Med. 387.

19. Id. Rhet. iii. 17. 2. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀγνοία αἰτία, ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τινες περὶ τοῦ δικαίου ἀμφισβητοῖεν.

Read ὥσπερ εἰ, and compare Xenophon de Theogn. ap. Stob. 88. 4. ὥσπερ εἰ ἵππικὸς ἂν συγγράψαιεν περὶ ἵππικης.

20. Menander ap. Stob. l.iii. 6. Vol. ii. p. 380. Gaisf. κομψὸς στρατιώτης, οὐδ' ἂν εἰ πλάττοι Θεὸς, οὐδεὶς γένοιτ' ἂν.

“*ἂν εἰ πλάττοι*] *ἂν πλάττη* A. B. i. e. οὐδ' *ἐὰν πλάττη*.” Gaisford. The old reading was οὐδ' *ἂν πλάττοι*, which Grotius altered into the received text, and Meineke wishes to use the same mode of emendation in other passages, *Fragm. Men.* p. 251.

With the Indicative.

1. Aristot. *Polit.* p. 313 D. καὶ συμβαίνει δὴ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον ὥστε πάντας ἄρχειν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ μετέβαλον οἱ σκυτεῖς καὶ οἱ τέκτονες καὶ μὴ οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ σκυτοτόμοι καὶ τέκτονες ἦσαν.

Read ὥσπερ εἰ. Below the particle is in its place, οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄρχουσιν οἱ δ' ἄρχονται παρὰ μέρος, ὥσπερ ἂν ἄλλοι γενόμενοι.

2. *Ib.* p. 328 D. E. For this passage we refer to our former article, p. 301.

3. *Ib.* p. 364 D. ἔπειτα τίς κοινοτάτη καὶ τίς αἰρετωτάτη μετὰ τὴν ἀρίστην πολιτείαν, κἂν εἰ τις ἄλλη τετύχηκεν ἀριστοκρατικῇ.

4. *Ib.* p. 365 B. ἔτι δὲ πρὸς ταῖς κατὰ πλοῦτον διαφοραῖς ἔστιν ἡ μὲν κατὰ γένος, ἡ δὲ κατ' ἀρετὴν, κἂν εἴ τι δὴ τοιοῦτον ἕτερον εἰρηται πόλεως εἶναι μέρος ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἀριστοκρατίαν.

5. *Ib.* p. 424 B. πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις περὶ ἀγῶνας ἐπιμέλεια γυμνικῶς καὶ Διονυσιακῶς, κἂν εἴ τις ἑτέρας συμβαίνει τοιαύτας γενέσθαι θεωρίας.

In these three passages we would again change κἂν into καὶ; and for the last, see the 5th example of the subjunctive mood. Compare also *Eth. Nic.* i. 13. 3. παραδείγμα δὲ τούτων ἔχομεν τοὺς Κρητῶν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων νομοθέτας, καὶ εἴ τις ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι γεγέννηται.¹

6. *Ib.* p. 430 A. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ, κἂν εἰ δεῖ κρίνειν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος ἀποβλέποντας, οὐ κατὰ τὸ τυχὸν πλῆθος τοῦτο οἰητέον.

Read οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' εἰ δεῖ.

7. *Ib.* p. 455 D. οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ὅσον διαφέρει καὶ περὶ τὴν τούτων θεωρίαν, δεῖ μὴ τὰ Παύσανος θεωρεῖν τοὺς νέους, ἀλλὰ τὰ Πολυγνώτου, κἂν εἴ τις ἄλλος τῶν γραφέων ἢ τῶν ἀγαλματοποιῶν ἔστιν ἠθικός.

8. *Ib.* p. 457 A. κἂν εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερόν ἐστιν.

9. *Id.* *Eth. Nic.* vi. 13. 7. δῆλον δέ, κἂν εἰ μὴ πρακτικὴ ἦν, ὅτι εἶδει ἂν αὐτῆς, &c.

10. *Id.* *Metaph.* i. 1. φρόνιμα μὲν ἄνευ τοῦ μανθάνειν, ὅσα μὴ δύναται ψόφῳ ἀκούειν, οἷον μέλιττα, κἂν εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἄλλο γένος ζώων ἔστιν.

In these last four passages we would resort to our former remedy.

¹ Eurip. ap. Stob. iv. 53. εἰ γὰρ τόδ' ἴσθι, κἂν εἴ σ' ἐλάνθανεν πάρος, | τὸ σκαῖν εἶναι πρῶτ' ἀμυνσίαν ἔχει. Here Gaisford has edited κεί σ' ἐλάνθανεν after the conjecture of Valckenaer and Porson.

11. Ib. i. 7. p. 19. Sylb. *περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν μίαν τιθεμένων αἰτίαν οἶαν εἰπομεν, ἔστω ταῦτ' εἰρημένα· τὸ δ' αὐτὸ κἂν εἴ τις ταῦτα πλεία τιθήσιν, οἷον Ἐμπεδοκλῆς τέτταρά φησιν εἶναι σώματα τὴν ὕλην.*

Read τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ εἴ τις. Thus a few lines above, κατὰ μὲν οὖν τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, οὐτ' εἴ τις τούτων λέγει τι πλὴν πυρὸς, οὐτ' εἴ τις ἄερος μὲν πυκνότερον τοῦτο τιθήσιν ὕδατος, δὲ λεπτότερον, οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἂν λέγοι.

12. Id. Eth. Nic. i. 9. 3. Here we formerly proposed to read καὶ for κἂν. Comp. Rhet. III. 10. 4. *ἀλλ' ὅσων ἢ ἅμα λεγομένων ἢ γνωσῶς γίγνεται, καὶ εἰ μὴ πρότερον ὑπῆρχεν, ἢ μικρὸν ὥστερ' ἢ διάνοια.*

We now come to a set of passages which are not defended either by Mr. Hermann or Mr. Stalbaum: the latter expressly saying, that "no example of such a construction occurs in any approved writer."

1. Plat. Phileb. p. 58 C. *κἂν εἰ σμικρὰ καὶ σμικρὰ δύναισα.*

Here Mr. Stalbaum and others have edited κἂν ἢ σμικρά.

2. Aristot. Polit. p. 305 E. *οἷον ὁ σίδηρος καὶ ἄργυρος κἂν εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον.*

Read καὶ εἴ τι, and compare Rhet. III. 12. 6.

3. Ib. p. 319 A. *ἀλλὰ μὴν εἴ γε τὰς μὲν γυναῖκας ποιήσει κοινας τὰς δὲ κτήσεις ἰδίας, τίς οἰκονομήσει, ὥσπερ τὰ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτῶν; κἂν εἰ κοιναὶ αἱ κτήσεις καὶ αἱ τῶν γεωργῶν γυναῖκες.*

Here we would read κἂν κοιναί, and explain the passage thus: "Again, if Plato would have the women in common, and the possessions appropriated, who is to attend to the cares of the household, as the men do the labors of the field? Or, indeed, who is to perform the household duties, even if both women and property are in common?"

4. Ib. p. 344 E. *σκαπτέον πότερον μίαν θετέον πολιτείαν ἢ πλείους, κἂν εἰ πλείους, τίνες καὶ πόσαι.*

5. Ib. p. 368 C. *ἔτι τὸ μὴ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων πολιτῶν ἐλεύθερον, κἂν εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἕτερον πλήθους εἶδος.*

In both these passages, for κἂν read καί.

6. Id. Poet. 47. *ἐπεὶ γάρ ἐστι μιμήτης ὁ ποιητής, ὥσπερ ἂν ἢ ζωγράφος ἢ τις ἄλλος εἰκονοποιός, ἀνάγκη μιμεῖσθαι, &c.*

Here three Mss. have ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ ἢ. For ourselves, we should be inclined to read ὥσπερ. See our remarks above on the sixth passage with the optative.

7. Id. Metaph. xi. 9. p. 208. Sylb. *εἴτε γὰρ μηδὲν νοεῖ, τί ἂν εἴη τὸ σεμνόν, ἀλλ' ἔχει ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ ὁ καθεύδων.* Thus Brandis, p. 254. 26. from his Mss. for ἂν εἴη ὁ καθ. We would read ὥσπερ ἂν ὁ καθεύδων, scil. ἔχοι.

A more diligent search will probably discover additional examples of *ἀν εἰ*, especially in Aristotle; but from those which have been collected, we would infer generally that when *ἀν* and *εἰ* refer to the same verb, the *εἰ* always precedes its attendant particle. Our chief grounds for maintaining this proposition are, that there is no metrical example of such a construction; a fact which (if unquestioned) seems to us of very great weight: that no instance is produced from Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, or indeed any writer, except Plato and Aristotle, whose text is confessedly very corrupt; and that the number of cases appears to increase with the corruptness of the text; the writings of Aristotle containing far more instances than those of Plato. On the ground of analogy, such a collocation appears also quite indefensible: nor is there any instance of *καὶ* preceding *εἰ* or *αἰ* in the epic poets; while the use of *ἀν* with the present tense of the indicative, seems utterly at variance with the spirit of the Greek language.

II.—On the use of the particles *ἄρα*, *ᾗρα*, and *ἄρα γε*.

The common opinion of grammarians seems to be, that *ᾗρα* and *ἄρα* are different forms of the same word: that *ἄρα* is always used in the interrogative; but that either form may be used indifferently in the illative sense, according to the convenience of the poet.¹

This opinion was first controverted by Mr. Hermann, who, in his Preface to the *Œdipus Coloneus*, attempts to show that *ἄρα* is always used as an exclamation or interrogative. The two words, however, he considers as having the same origin; and that *ἄρα* was lengthened from *ᾗρα*, by being used at the beginning of sentences: ² a conjecture which we shall not endeavour directly to confirm or overthrow; but shall make a remark on the etymology of the word *ἄρα*, which is certainly very obvious, and appears to be tolerably certain.

The particles *ἦ* *ρα* are used by Homer and other ancient

¹ *The Attic poets use the first syllable (of ἄρα) also as long, and it is then written ᾗρα*, Matthiæ Gr. Gr. § 614. *Communis doctorum opinio est, pro ἄρα, ποίηται metri causa etiam ᾗρα dixisse.* Hermann, Præf. ad *Œd.* C. p. x.

² Mr. Hermann explains his meaning thus: *τίς ἄρα σώσει ἡμᾶς*; means, "Who will be the person to save us?" *ῥώσει ἄρα τις*; "Is there then any one to save us?" But if the interrogation was meant to apply to the whole sentence, *ἄρα* was put at the beginning, *ἄρα σώσει τις*; and thus acquired the accent of the interrogation, besides its own. This appears to us to be a confusion of accent and quantity. No number of accents will increase the length of a syllable.

writers, as well as by those who imitated the ancient language, at the beginning of a sentence, either in an asseverative and exclamatory, or in an interrogative sense.¹ Thus:

Π. δ'. 93. ἢ ῥά νύ μοι τι πίθοιο, Λυκάονος υἱὲ δαΐφρον; Compare γ'. 48. ξ'. 190.

Π. ε'. 421. Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ ῥά τί μοι κεχολάσσαι ὅττι κεν εἴπω;

Π. ε'. 762. Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἢ ῥά τί μοι κεχολάσσαι, αἶ κεν Ἀρηα, &c.

Od. κ'. 462. ἢ ῥ' ἤδη μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες ἔνδον ἴασιν;

Π. γ'. 182. ὦ μάκαρ Ἀτρεΐδῃ, μοιρηγενὲς, δλβιδάιμον,
ἢ ῥά νύ τοι πολλοὶ δεδμήατο κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν.

Π. ε'. 715. ἢ ῥ' ἄλιον τὸν μῦθον ὑπέστημεν Μενελάῳ.

Π. ζ'. 215. ἢ ῥά νύ μοι ξείνος πατρώϊός ἐσσι παλαιός.

Π. κ'. 401. ἢ ῥά νύ τοι μεγάλων δώρων ἐπεμαίετο θυμὸς, &c. &c.

Alcæus ap. Hephæst. p. 90. Gaisf. (Blomf. No. 40. Matth. No. 70.)

ἢ ῥ' ἔτι Δινομένει τῷ Τυρρακῇ
τάρμενα λαμπρὰ κέαι' ἐν μυρσινήῳ.

Matthiæ on this passage refers to Apollonius Dyscolus in Bekker's Anecdota, p. 490: a testimony of great importance to the present question, and which we should reproach Mr. Hermann for not having mentioned, if we were not ourselves indebted for it to the above-named scholar.

ἄρα. οὗτος κατὰ πᾶσαν διαλεκτὸν, ὑπεσταλμένης τῆς κοινῆς καὶ Ἀττικῆς, ἦρα λέγεται.

ἢ ῥ' ἔτι παρθενίης ἐπιβάλλομαι;

Σακφῷ.

ἢ ῥ' ἔστι θύδωρ σ

ἐπὶ τοῦ τοιοῦτου οὐκ ἐμποδίζοντός τινος συναλοιφὴν ἐκδέξασθαι Τρύφων φησὶν ἀποκοπὴν παρεχολουθηκέναι· καὶ ἔτι

ἦρά κεν ἐν δεσμοῖς ἐθέλοις;

παρ' Ἀλκμᾶνι

ἦρα τὸν Φοῖβον ὄνειρον εἶδον.

Ἀρχίλοχος μέντοι κοινότερον ἔφη

² ὥς ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ καίετος ξυνωνίαν.

¹ It seems at first sight, that there is not much connexion between asseveration and interrogation: yet every person who has either heard or read the examination of a witness, knows that it is very common to put a question in an affirmative shape, and mark the meaning by the tone and manner. Thus, in the first example quoted from Homer, it is indifferent whether Minerva says to Pandarus, "I am sure you will do what I ask you," or "will you do what I ask you?" And an editor of Homer would be at liberty either to add or omit the sign of interrogation.

² This passage of Archilochus and another, τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κεράλη συνήντητο, (Fragm. 38, 39. ed. Gaisford.) seem to offer more difficulty than any adduced by Mr. Hermann.

Theocrit. Id. xviii. 10.

ἡ ῥά τίς ἐσσι λίαν βαρυγούνατος ; ἡ ῥα φίλυπνος ;

ἡ ῥα πολὺν τιν' ἔπινες ;

i. e. "Are you very wearied? Are you fond of sleep? Have you drunk too much wine?"

Now it is of the two particles, ἡ ῥα, that the Attic word *ἄρα* is, we conceive, compounded, the *H* being changed into the long *A*, as in so many words transferred from the ancient Hellenic into the Attic dialect.¹ In the first place, it should be observed, that ἡ ῥα never occurs in any Attic, or *ἄρα* in any epic writer; while *ἄρα* was always used by all writers: a fact which strongly supports the etymology proposed. And secondly, that the exclamatory and interrogative senses assigned by Mr. Hermann to *ἄρα* also exactly suit ἡ ῥα. That this may be more clearly seen, we will put down some of the passages in which *ἄρα* is used as an exclamation; its interrogative sense being too common to require illustration.

Soph. Aj. 980. ὦμοι, βαρείας ἄρα τῆς ἐμῆς τύχης. Eurip. Hipp. 1086. κλάων τις αὐτῶν ἄρ' ἐμοῦ γε θίξεται. Soph. Oed. C. 408. οὐκ ἄρ' ἐμοῦγε μὴ κρατήσωσιν ποτε. Here Elmsley would read οὐτ' ἄρ' ἐμοῦγε. But several passages cited by Mr. Hermann seem to defend this use of *ἄρα* after οὐκ. (Soph. Aj. 1238. Phil. 106. 114; Aristoph. Av. 91.) And it should be observed, generally, that the chief change introduced by the Athenians in the use of ἡ ῥα or *ἄρα* is as to its position in a sentence; being in the epic poets constantly placed at the beginning, while in the flexible language of Athens it might vary its situation.

In conformity then with the distinction which Mr. Hermann lays down between the meanings of *ἄρα* and *ἄρα*, he proceeds to correct all the passages which disagree with his rule, declaring, "*ubi neque interrogationi neque exclamationi locus est, non esse ferendum ἄρα.*" It appears to us, from the passages quoted above, for the use of the particles ἡ ῥα, that a third sense may be added, viz. of assertion or asseveration. Hence we would not object to the line of Aristophanes, Ach. 347. ἐμίλ-λατ' ἄρ' ἅπαντες ἀνασεύειν βοῆν, i. e. "of a truth I thought you would all raise a shout," where Mr. Hermann corrects ἅπαν-τῶντες. We would say the same of Av. 1688. εἰς καιρὸν ἄρα

¹ Apoll. Dys. ap. Bekk. Anecd. p. 494. εἴρηται ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦ ἄρα εἰς ἡ μετατί-θετο παρὰ ταῖς ἄλλαις διαλέκτοις, ὑπεσταλμένης τῆς Ἀττικῆς. This is the usual fault of the grammarians, viz. of mistaking the ancient for arbitrary variations of the recent forms.

κατεκόπησαν οὐτοῖς | εἰς τοὺς γάμους. "Truly, they were just killed in time for the marriage-feast:" of which verse Mr. H. says, "*vereor ne vocula aliqua exciderit, ut ἔς καιρὸν ἄρα πῶς.*"

If the above arguments are just, the Attic form ἄρα was derived from the two particles ἦ ῥα, and always has the force of an interrogation, an asseveration, or an exclamation; and is independent of any preceding proposition. Ἄρα, however, has an illative meaning, and is dependent on some previous proposition.¹ Allied to which is its sense of ὡς ἔοικεν, "*naturally, as may be expected,*" &c.: and it really seems to have an etymological affinity with ἄρα, in the sense of *fitness* or *adaptation*. But we conceive that it has no connexion either in sense or derivation with ἄρα; though the similarity of letters (but not to the Greeks of sound) has produced a confusion.²

Now it has been remarked by a writer who has made the language of the ancient poets his particular study, that in Homer γε is always an emphatic particle, and is never used after conjunctions, particles, &c.; such as δέ, μέν, ῥα, &c.³ Accordingly, ἦ ῥα γε does not once occur in Homer:⁴ nor, indeed, is γε used after ἄρα by Thucydides or the tragedians (as far as we are aware); the earliest instances being found in Aristophanes.

We will set down those which occur in Küster's edition.

Nub. 465.

ἄρα γε τοῦτ',
ἄρ' ἐγὼ ποτ' ἐπόψομαι;
ἄρα γ' οἶσθα τοῦθ', ὅτι

Av. 1221.

δικαιότατ' ἂν ληφθεῖσα πασῶν Ἰγίδων
ἀπέθαγες;

¹ Aristot. Rhet. II. 23. 8. ἄλλος ἐξ ὀρισμοῦ ὅλον "τί τὸ δαμονύν ἐστιν; ἄρα θεὸς ἢ θεοῦ ἔργον." καίτοι ὅστις οἶεται θεοῦ ἔργον εἶναι, τοῦτον ἀνάγκη οἶσθαι καὶ θεοὺς εἶναι. Read ἄρα θεὸς ἢ θεοῦ ἔργον; Another difference between the particles ἄρα and ἄρα is, that whereas the former was originally and properly used at the beginning of a sentence, the latter never was: a difference which is well exemplified in the following passage: Aristot. de Interpret. p. 68, 9. Sylb. ἄρα γε Σωκράτης σοφός; οὐ. Σωκράτης ἄρα οὐ σοφός.

² ἦ γάρ, instead of ἦ ῥα or ἄρα, is constantly used as an interrogative in Plato (Lex. Tim. in v. et Rubnk.); but kept its archaic form in the Attic dialect, probably because the particles would not so readily coalesce, and therefore, not being in such familiar use, did not undergo any change in the mouths of the Athenians. Compare Schol. Plat. Phædr. p. 262. συνδεσµὸς ἀπορηµατικὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρα τὸ ἦ, ὡς τὸ ἦ μῦθοι φιλέουσ' ἀλόχου μερόπων ἀνθρώπων Ἀτρεΐδαι;

³ Knight Proleg. Homer. § 149.

⁴ Hom. Hymn. Apoll. 3. καὶ ῥά τ' ἀναίσσουσιν. "*Legebatur καὶ ῥά γ' ἀναίσσουσιν, quod nihili est.*" Hermann ad loc. The last editor reads καὶ γὰρ ἀναίσσουσιν.

On the Chronology of the Holy Scriptures. 207

- Plut. 546. ἄρά γε πολλῶν
ἀγαθῶν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποφαίνω σ' αἵτιον οὖσαν ;
Nub. 804. ἄρά γ' αἰσθάνει πλείστα ;
ἄρ' αἰσθάνει Dindorf.
Vesp. 484. ἄρά γ', ὃ πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, ὑμεῖς ἀπαλλαχθεῖτέ μου ;
ἄρ' ἂν ὦ Dindorf.

In Xenophon, also, the same collocation of particles sometimes occurs ; e. g. Mem. Socrat. 1. 5. 4. ἄρά γε οὐ χρη πάντα ἄνδρα, &c. ; 1b. 111. 8. 3. ἄρά γε, ἔφη, ἔρωτᾷς με εἰ τι οἶδα πυρετοῦ ἀγαθόν ; 111. 2. 2. &c.

In turning over the pages of Plato we do not perceive any instance of this usage, although there is so much interrogation ; with the exception of the following passage, which is from a doubtful dialogue ; Alcib. 11. p. 138 A. ὃ Ἀλκιβιάδῃ, ἄρά γε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν προσευξόμενος πορεύει ;

In Aristotle this interrogative use of ἄρά γε is very common, as we remarked in our last number, and collected several instances, to which we beg to refer the reader, note to 111. 2. 17. p. 279.¹

We are not, however, aware of any passage in which ἄρα is followed by γε, either of an ancient or modern writer, except Aristot. Eth. Nic. v. 2. 3. ἔστιν ἄρα γέ τις ἄλλη ἀδικία, where γε should probably be expunged. Compare v. 3. 11. ἔσται ἄρα ὡς ὁ ὄρος, &c.²

G. C. L.

On the Difference in the Chronology of the Samaritan and Greek Versions and the Hebrew Text of the Scriptures.

THE difference which exists between the chronology of the Samaritan and Greek versions of the Scripture and the Hebrew text, and the discrepancies which at every page are found in the reckoning of this latter are of too striking a nature not to have been noticed by every attentive reader of the Bible. With-

¹ The two references there given should be to 1. 6. 12. (where see Zell) and 1. 10. 2.

² Particulam γε solenni vitio a librariis additam bis delevi. Elmsl. ad Eur. Her. 204. Tim. Lex. Photius, ἦπου, ἔραγε. Read ἦπου, ἄρα γε. But ἦπου rather means *surely*, and is not interrogative. (See Elmsley ad Eur. Med. 1275 ; and, on the other hand, Hermann ad Med. 14.) In conclusion we may remark, that the accurate Dr. Elmsley, in his preface to the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, p. viii. says, that τᾶρα is compounded of τοι ἄρα : it is evidently compounded of τοι ἄρα.

out speaking of the Samaritan version, which is evidently wrong, the difference between the Hebrew text and the Greek translation, according to Dr. Russell, amounts to 1437 years; according to Riccioli, to 1630; and according to the Alphonsine Tables, 2996 from Adam to Christ. The late discoveries made in the reading of hieroglyphics, and the many monuments which have been brought to light from Karnac, Louqsor, Abydos, Thebes, Memphis, and indeed from the whole of Egypt and Nubia, merely because they contradict the chronology of the Hebrew text, have been looked on with an unjust contempt by those who have never paid any attention to the subject. The object therefore, of the present article, is to show that the authenticity of these monuments is undeniable; that they do not contradict, nor are they contradicted by the Mosaic account, according to the Septuagint version, however they may differ from the chronology of the Hebrew text. The whole is derived from one of the lectures which the MARQUIS SPINETO read lately in Cambridge and in London on the interesting discoveries recently made in hieroglyphics, in which he endeavored to reconcile the Biblical chronology with the Egyptian monuments and the Egyptian historian Manetho.

As every reader of the Bible must be well acquainted with the discrepancies that almost at every page are to be met with in the English translation of Scripture, which follows the reckoning of the Hebrew text, we do not think it necessary to enumerate any of them; although the Marquis, for the sake of establishing his point, might have been compelled to notice some. We shall therefore, follow our lecturer from the moment in which he turns his attention to the birth of Abraham: a point highly interesting for him to establish, inasmuch as this patriarch visited Egypt at a time when that country had already acquired a great degree of civilization and power: by establishing the date of his appearance at the court of the Pharaoh then reigning, every objection will be removed that can be urged against the antiquity of Egypt.

Now, according to the Hebrew text, the birth of Abraham happened in the year 292 after the flood, and 162 years after Nimrod. Taking his station on these data, our lecturer shows that as Nimrod was the son of Cush, "the mighty hunter," who began to be "a mighty one in the earth," the date of his birth, which is stated at 130 years after the flood, must be wrong. Gen. x. 8, 9.

Between Noah and Nimrod, says the Marquis, we know there were only three generations. Noah begat Ham, Ham begat Cush, and Cush begat Nimrod: according to the sacred pages,

in the first generation we have seven male individuals in the family of Japheth, four in that of Ham, five in that of Shem ; in all sixteen males. Before a wife can be given to each of these, we must suppose an equal number of daughters born in the respective families of these three brothers. Now let us suppose that these sixteen married couples were as fruitful as their parents, and that consequently each produced five sons and five daughters ; the result will be $16 \times 10 = 160$ at the birth of Cush.

These 160 individuals make eighty married couples ; and on the same principle, allowing to each ten children, we shall have $80 \times 10 = 800$, as the number of children produced. To these, adding their fathers and mothers, their grandfathers and their grandmothers, and even their great grand-parents Noah and his wife, we have 1000 individuals in the whole. For the whole account will run thus :

Noah, with his wife, his three sons and their wives	8
Children of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, amongst whom Cush	32
Grand-children of these patriarchs, amongst whom Nimrod	160
Children of these	$800 = 1000$

This is much too small a number to produce the usurpation of Nimrod, the building of Babel, the dispersion of mankind. For in the computation just made, more than one half were infants and young children, and therefore unable to assist in the mighty work of the building of Babel, and the foundation of the empire of Babylon.

In this computation eighty males have been allowed to the second generation after Noah, when in fact the Scripture reckons only thirty-six. For in Genesis x. and xi. we have seven males recorded in the family of Japheth, twenty-four in that of Ham, and five in that of Shem = thirty-six.

On these considerations it certainly appears that the chronology of the Hebrew text is much too short, and that the reckoning of the Septuagint, which places the birth of Nimrod in the year 334 after the flood, that is 204 years later, is more reasonable, as the period of 334 years is long enough to allow a sufficient increase of mankind, and forty or fifty years after, to found empires and to separate under different leaders.

If then the date of the birth of Nimrod, as it is stated in the Hebrew text, is wrong, it follows that the date of the birth of Abraham must be equally so. For, according to that reckoning, this patriarch visited Egypt 292 years after the flood, and he was then sixty-six years old. Gen. xii. 4. We must therefore have recourse to the Septuagint, and there we find the birth of Abraham to have happened in the year 1070 after the flood.

This account of the Septuagint is confirmed also by profane

history, by Syncellus, Alexander Polyhistor, Africanus, and the celebrated Moses Choronenis, who in his Armenian history has preserved a valuable fragment from Abydenus, an industrious compiler of Chaldean records. And indeed all these writers appear to have copied from more ancient authors the events which they have recorded, the date of which is now lost in the darkness of a very remote antiquity.

All these historians agree in mentioning the names of eighteen different kings who succeeded Nimrod at Babylon; and from their accounts it seems quite an established fact, that Abraham was a contemporary with Ninus, and that between Nimrod and Ninus three successive dynasties held the throne of that empire for the space of 657 years; when Ninus having conquered Arbelus, the fourth descendant of Belus, founded the Assyrian empire, strictly so called. He was a descendant of Ashur, the first founder of that monarchy, "who," according to the Mosaic account, "went forth from the land of Babel and built Nineveh, and other cities."

If therefore; to the 364 years, when Nimrod built Babylon, the whole duration of that monarchy previous to Ninus be added, the sum will be $364 + 657 = 1021$ for the date of the birth of Ninus; and as this conqueror was a contemporary of Abraham, it follows that the computation of the Septuagint, which places the birth of that patriarch in the year 1070 after the flood, is nearer to the mark.

Again, when Abraham visited Egypt, that country had already attained a very high degree of civilisation and power; but the natural state of Egypt, exposed to violent inundations and drought, was such as to require an immensity of labour to cut the numberless canals which were to carry the superabundant waters into the vast reservoirs, from which at proper times they were again to be distributed over the land. The performance of such works, the building of cities such as those which are exhibited by their gigantic ruins, require a numerous population, and a length of time; in short, the assistance of ages.

This length of time may be easily conceived from perusing the 23d chapter of Genesis; where an account is given of the purchase of the field of Machpelah made by Abraham to bury his wife, for which he paid "four hundred shekels of silver current money." But coined money presupposes the digging of the mines, the art of melting and working metals; in which even modern experience, assisted by the vast power of machinery we possess, requires an immensity of labour, and a great length of time.

Although it would be impossible in so short an article to follow the ingenious lecturer in all the reasonings by which he

resolves the several objections that may be urged against him, yet we cannot pass over in silence the manner in which he explains the discrepancies that are observed in the names, dates, and number of the sovereigns who are recorded to have existed during a certain period. Every king, says he, had more than one name, and it was a matter of convenience and taste to an historian by which of them he should be called. The son of Shapor II. was called *Kerman-shah* by his subjects; by the European writer, *Carmasat*; by the historian, *Baharam*: a name which he assumed on his mounting the throne of Persia. Even in the books of Chronicles we find the wife of Ahasuerus mentioned under the name of *Hadassah*, the niece of Mordecai; by the Grecian historian she is designated as the prudent *Esther*, and by the Persian poet as the beautiful *Satira*. Daniel is occasionally called *Belteshazzar*, and the three children *Hannaniuh*, *Michael*, and *Azariah*, under a change of circumstances appear under the denomination of *Shadrach*, *Meshach*, and *Abednego*. *Thammuz* of Ezechiel is called *Thaumas* by the Greek mythologist, and *Adonis* by the Phœnician historian.

In a manner equally satisfactory the Marquis explains the objection arising from the immense number of thousands and thousands of years which Manetho gives to the Egyptian monarchy previous to the Pharaohs, a period so much exceeding the computation even of the Alphonsine tables as to appear no less fabulous than the annals of the Chinese and Babylonians. On the authority of Mr. Gibert, who published at Amsterdam, in 1743, a curious tract on this subject, the Marquis considers these years in most cases to be diurnal revolutions of the sun. According to this principle he divides by 365 the 473,000 years of the Chaldeans, and the result is 1296 years for the whole duration of their monarchy, and this is precisely the period assigned by Eusebius from Atlas to Alexander, perfectly agreeing with the chronology of the Septuagint. For the invasion of Alexander happened 1682 years after the death of Abraham; and Eusebius, following the same chronology, observes, that Atlas made astronomical discoveries 384 years after the death of Abraham: deducting therefore 384 from 1682, the result is 1298. This sum, with the difference of nearly 69 years, is mentioned also by Callisthenes, though at first sight it appears quite contradicting the statement of the Septuagint. In the same manner the 150,000 years mentioned by Alexander Polyhistor, who had copied Berosus, may be reduced to 411 solar years, as the period during which historical memoirs had been preserved at Babylon previous to the irruption of Alexander: because Nabonassar lived 411 years before this Grecian con-

queror, and he having destroyed every possible historical monument, the preservation of them must be dated from his time. The most curious part however, is that in which the Marquis endeavors to reconcile the Chinese chronology with the Egyptian and the Septuagint.

The first astronomical observations made in China were 150 years before the emperor Yao, who, according to M. Fréret, lived 2145 B.C. By adding therefore, these two sums together we have the sum 2295 : this epoch differs only by a little more than one year from that of the Babylonians, and by no means exceeds the chronology of the sacred pages. These observations were made nearly nine centuries after the flood, more than 500 years after Nimrod, not quite two centuries before Ninus and Abraham, and consequently posterior to the first establishment of the Egyptian monarchy under Mizraim the brother of Cush, the father of Nimrod.

Having thus stated the grounds on which the chronology of the Septuagint version is to be preferred to that of the Hebrew text, the Marquis gives a curious and interesting account of the manner in which they were made to differ. Till the year 127 after Christ there was but one system of chronology, and this had been followed by all chronographers and historians whether sacred or profane, both before and after the birth of our Saviour. This chronology was that of the Hebrew text itself, and consequently the chronology of the several versions that had been made of it, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint.

Amongst the many arguments that might be adduced to prove this to have been the fact, we may quote one which appears to be extremely conclusive. Josephus openly and repeatedly asserts that he had compiled his *Antiquities* from the Hebrew Scriptures, and yet his chronology coincides with the computation of the Septuagint, and disagrees with the reckoning of the Hebrew text just as much as the Septuagint now does.

This chronology of the Hebrew text, as it has been adopted by Josephus, was in fact the only reckoning known, and was generally followed by all heathen writers before the birth of Christ, and by both heathen and Christian after his death. In short, before the first part of the second century of our era, no traces can be found of any controversy, nor mention made of any difference between the Greek version and the Hebrew original of the Holy Bible. All the authors who quote the Old Testament at that early period, whether Jews, Christians or Heathens, and even before them, the apostles and our Saviour, have recourse to the Hebrew text and the Greek version indiscriminately without

the least indication or suspicion of their not agreeing either in regard to language, facts, or dates.

The difference therefore, which we now find in the chronology of these two texts of our Scriptures, is the work of a time posterior to the first century after Christ, and it seems now that it did not take place before the year 80 of the second century. About that time a new translation of the Old Testament into Greek was produced under the auspices of a leading Rabbi, the object of which was to bring into discredit the venerable work of the seventy : this task was performed by a learned man and a pagan priest of the name of Aquila, who after having embraced Christianity, was, for his heretical opinions, expelled from the bosom of the church, and therefore attached himself to the Jews for the sake of injuring and calumniating the Christians and their religion.

Although the liberties which Aquila and the Rabbi used with the original text were soon perceived and exposed ; yet two years after a work appeared, entitled *Seder olam Rabba*, that is, the Great Chronicle of the World, which presented to the Jews the first-fruits of the labors which the enemies of Christianity had bestowed on the Hebrew writings. This mutilated system of chronology was put forth under the name of *Rabbi Josi*, and favored by the countenance of the notorious Akiba, the supporter of the rebel and false Christ, Barchocab.

The publication of the *Seder olam Rabba*, may with certainty be regarded as marking the epoch at which the Jews altered the dates of the great events recorded in their sacred books, and they then adopted the abbreviated scheme of ancient chronology. The object, as it has already been stated, was, that as the Christians were wont to produce the testimonies of Scripture against the Jews out of the Greek version, the Jews were obliged to appeal from that Greek version which alone the Christians understood, to the Hebrew text which they understood not ; and in order to avoid the arguments of the Christians, they not only translated their original Scriptures in a different manner, but also altered the dates.

For five or six centuries this flagrant treachery of the Jews was at different times exposed, and consequently their new chronology was not adopted by Christian writers. But about the year 720 the Venerable Bede produced his work, "*De Temporum Ratione, de Sex Ætatibus Mundi, &c.*" in which he endeavored to introduce the reckoning of the Jews. But his reasoning was ill received and neglected ; though perhaps during the dark ages the weight of his name might have procured some followers to his opinion.

On the revival of learning, the controversy was renewed with vigor and freedom ; and it soon called into the field the powerful talents of Scaliger, Petavius, Vossius, Pezron, and Usher. By the gigantic efforts of these justly celebrated men, the reckoning of the Septuagint was again fully established ; but at the time of the Reformation, the most stern of the reformers, finding that the Samaritan computation was wrong, and wishing to oppose in every thing the doctrines of the church of Rome, decided that the chronology of the Greek version must be equally wrong ; and without analysing the grounds of their decision, they threw the weight of their authority in favor of the original Hebrew ; and they succeeded in introducing, at least among the Protestants, the corrupt chronology of the Hebrew text.

Such are the observations that appear to us most worthy of remark in the lecture on chronology by the Marquis Spineto. Of course he establishes his positions by reasoning and arguments, which we, in the narrow limits of our article, cannot enumerate. What we have stated however, will be sufficient to direct the attention of our readers to this most interesting and important object : an object which we recommend with earnestness to every reader of the Bible, and of ancient literature, to pursue, as most fitted to enable him to explain those discrepancies of dates and of expressions, which have given such a handle to the enemies of Christianity for vilifying religion. We hear with pleasure, that the Marquis Spineto intends to publish his lectures on hieroglyphics, and that they are actually in the press : we wish him every possible success ; indeed, we have no doubt that they will be patronised with the same liberality in print as they were when heard.

CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM GRÆCARUM;
*auctoritate et impensis Classis Historicæ et Philologicæ
 Academiæ Literarum Borussicæ edidit AUGUSTUS
 BOECKHIUS, Academiæ Socius. Berolini, ex offi-
 cina Academica. Vendit G. Reimer, Libraria, Vol. i.
 Fasciculus primus, 1825: pag. 1—292. Fasciculus
 secundus, 1826: pag. 293—572. Fol.*

PART III.—[Continued from No. LXXVII.]

WE now come to *Pars Secunda, Inscriptiones Atticæ*. They are divided into twelve classes ; and *Classis prima* contains,

Acta Senatus et Populi, Universitatum et Collegiorum. The Attic inscriptions are, as may be supposed, exceedingly numerous, and Boeckh has collected nearly a thousand of them. Some of the most important Attic inscriptions are to be found in Rose's *Inscript. Græcæ Vetustissimæ*, especially in Class. III. sect. 2.; but whoever will take the trouble to compare Rose's work with Boeckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum*, will soon perceive that Boeckh stands unrivalled in point of reading the inscriptions, as well as illustrating them. Already, the inscription which stands at the head of the *Classis prima*, (Rose, Class III. Sect. 11. Insc. VI.) will show the difference between the two editors. "Forma jurisjurandi ibi traditur Scambonidarum ministro quodam ut videtur præstandi," says Rose; but he does not tell us who the Scambonidæ were. We learn from Boeckh that they were a demus of the Leontis, and perhaps a gens too, as he infers from the patronymic form of the word. What Rose calls "minister Scambonidarum," is shown by Boeckh to be the curator (*ταμίας*), or also the sacerdos (*ιερεὺς*) of the demus or gens. Boeckh infers from the words *ἐν ἀγορᾷ τῇ Σκαμβωνιδῶν*, and from the circumstance that this inscription was found near the temple of Theseus, that the ἀγορὰ of the Scambonides was near the temple of Theseus: assuming that there were separate ἀγοραὶ τῶν δημοτῶν, as well as ἀγοραὶ τῶν φυλετῶν; but perhaps ἀγορὰ does not mean here a forum, but only a meeting (concio).

Inscription 74 is in Rose's work *Inscript. IX. Class. III. Sect. 11.*

"Osannus inscriptionem restituere conatus est, cui tamen pessime res cessit," says Rose; and he reads thus:—

τὴν ξυμμαχίαν
ων Κλέανδρος ἐξέ(νος
nomina corrupta sunt
(ΑΨ)εύδους ἄρχοντος, κ
... δης πρώτος ἐγραμμ(άτευε)
εἶπε Καλλίας
(σπονδὰς εἶν)αι Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Ῥηγίνοις
δημοσάντων Ἀθηνα(ίων)
(δίκαι)α καὶ ἄδολα καὶ
(Ἀθην)αίων Ῥηγίνοις κα(ι)
(ξύμμ)αχοι ἐσόμεθα πιστ(οί)
(ισχ)υροὶ καὶ ἀβλαβεῖς

Boeckh reads thus:

... ITENXSYMMAXIAN
... PEAINJONKY EANDPOXZEN

..... ΤΙΝΟΣΙΥΕΝΟΣΦΟΚΟ
 .. ΕΓ'ΑΦΣ]ΕΥΔΟΣΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣΚ[ΑΙΕΓ'ΙΤΕΣΒΟΥΕΣΗ
 ΕΙ] ΔΕΣΓΡΟΤΟΣΕΛΡΑΜΜ[ΑΤΕΥΕΝ
 ΕΔΟΧΣΕΝΤΕΙΒΟ]ΥΕΙΚΑΙΤΟΙΔΕΜΟΙΑΘ'ΕΝΑΙΟΝ . . .
 ΣΕΓΡΥΤΑΝΕΥΕΧ]ΑΡΙΑΣΕΛΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥ[ΕΝ
 ΕΓ'ΕΣΤΑΤ]ΕΚΑΥΥΙ[. . ΕΙΓΕΝ

ΧΣΥΜΜΑΧΙΑΝΕΝ]ΑΙΑΘΕΝΑΙΟΙΣΚΑΙ[ΡΕΛΙΝΟΙΣΤ-
 ΟΝΔΕΓΙ
 ΧΟΡΙΟΝΗΟΡΚΟΝ]ΟΜΟΣΑΝΤΟΝΑΘΕΝΑ[ΙΟΙΚΑΙΡΕ-
 ΛΙΝΟΙΕΣ
 ΤΟΔΕΠΑΝΤΑΠΙΣ]ΤΑΚΑΙΑΔΟΥΑΚΑΙΗ[ΑΓΥΑΚΑΙΙΣ-
 ΧΥΡΑΚΑΙ
 ΑΒΥΑΒΕΑΓΑΘΕΝ]ΑΙΟΝΡΕΛΙΝΟΙΣΚΑ[ΙΑΓ'ΟΡΕΛΙ-
 ΝΟΝΑΘΕΝΑ
 ΙΟΙΣΚΑΙΧΣΥΜΜ]ΑΧΟΙΕΣΟΜΕΘΑΓ'ΙΣ[ΤΟΙΚΑΙΑΔΟΥ-
 ΟΙΚΑΙ
 ΗΑΓΥΟΙΚΑΙΙΣΧ]ΥΡΟΙΚΑΙΑΒΥΑΒΕΣ
 ΟΦΕΥΕΣΟΑΥ

ι την ξυμμαχίαν
 'Ρηγίν]ων, Κλέανδρος Ξεν-
 τίνου, Σιληνός Φώκου
 ἐπ' 'Αψ[εύδους ἄρχοντος κ]αὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς
 δης πρῶτος ἐγραμμ[άτευσεν
 η' "Εδοξεν τῇ βου]λῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ 'Αθ[ηναίων
 ι
 ς ἐπρυτάνευσεν χ]αρίας ἐγραμμάτευσεν
 ἐπεστάτ]ει, Καλλι[. . εἶπεν.

Ξυμμαχίαν εἶναι 'Αθηναίοις καὶ 'Ρηγίνοις τὸν δ' ἐπι-
 χῶριον ὄρκον] ὁμοσάντων 'Αθηνα[ῖοι καὶ 'Ρηγίνοι. ἔσ-
 τω δὲ πάντα πισ]τὰ καὶ ἄδολα καὶ ἀ[πλᾶ καὶ ἰσχυρὰ καὶ
 ἀβλαβῇ ἀπ' 'Αθηναίων 'Ρηγίνοις κα[ὶ] ἀπὸ 'Ρηγίνων 'Αθηνα-
 ίοις, καὶ ξύμμ]αχοι ἐσόμεθα πισ[τοὶ καὶ ἄδολοι καὶ
 ἀπλοὶ καὶ ἰσχ]υροὶ καὶ ἀβλαβεῖς
 ὀφείλεσθαι

Boeckh did not put after τῷ δήμῳ 'Αθηναίων the name of the
 φυλὴ which ἐπρυτάνευσεν: we should suppose, from the number of
 letters wanting, it must be 'Ακαμαντῖς.

Boeckh shows that the first lines must have been to this
 effect, that the treaty, which the Athenians were going to con-
 clude with the people of Rhegium, had been ratified by the
 latter. Thus Thuc. iv. 118. says, in speaking of the treaty
 with the Lacedæmonians, καθὰ ξυγχαρῶσι Λακεδαιμόνιοι. Then
 followed the name of the negotiators. That καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς is

well supplied, is proved from other inscriptions. Thus, Inscription 147. Ἀθηναῖοι ἀνέλωσαν ἐπὶ Γλαυκίππου ἄρχοντος καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς ᾗ, &c. The name of the ἐπιστάτης was also commonly given, as Thuc. iv. 118. proves; and the inscription from Karbatos, (Rose, Inscript. Class. 111. Sect. 1. Inscript. v.) which begins thus: ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Κεκροπὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Μνησίθεος ἐγραμμάτευεν, Εὐπαίθης ἐπεστάται, Καλλίας εἶπεν. Next, it is evident that we must read *ξυμμαχίαν εἶναι*, not *σπονδὰς*, as Rose reads, on the authority of Osann: the first line of the inscription renders the reading of Boeckh evident; τὸν ἐπιχώριον ὄρκον is taken from Thucyd. v. 47. et 18., and the rest of the formulary is made up from other inscriptions, where such expressions as *ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀδόλως* occur. Such diplomatical formularies do not evince, we confess, any great political honesty on either side of the contracting parties; and how little matters have changed in Greece in this respect will appear from the first article of the capitulation which the Greeks of Athens concluded in June, 1822, with the Turks. Κεφ. α'. Οἱ Τούρκοι [Ἔ]να παραδώσουσιν τὰ ὅπλα τῶν καὶ τὴν Ἀκρόπολιν με[τὰ] ὅλα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ εὑρισκόμενα πράγματα ἄνευ τινὸς δόλου." Cf. London Magazine, Feb. 1826, p. 204, where this specimen of a modern Greek σύμβολον is given entire.

Inscription 84. The marble was sent by Fauvel from Athens:

..... ΕΝΕΣΙ Ν . . ΕΝ . . ΚΑ
 . . ΤΟ]ΔΗΜ[ΟΦΑΝ]ΟΚ[ΡΙΤΟ]ΤΗΝΕΥΕΡΓΕΣ[ΙΑΝ
 ΑΝ]ΑΓ[ΡΑΨΑΙΕΝΣΤΗΛΕΙ]ΑΙΟΣΝΕΝΕΙΣ[ΑΚ
 Ρ]ΟΠΟΛ[ΙΝΚ]ΑΛΕΣΑΙ]ΔΕΑΥΤΟΝΕΠΙΞΕΝ[Ι
 Α]ΕΙΣΤΟΠΡΥΤΑΝΕΙΟΝΕΙΣΑΥΡΙΟΝ
 ΝΕΦΑΛΟΣΕΙ:ΠΕΤΑΜΕΝΑΛΛΑΚΑΘΑΠΕΡ[Τ
 ΗΙΒΟΛΕΙΑΝΑΓΡΑΨΑΙΔΕΦΑΝΟΚΡΙΤΟΝ
 ΤΟΝΠΑΡΙΑΝΟΝΠΡΟΞΕΝΟΝΚΑΙΕΥΕΡ[ΓΕ
 ΤΗΝΑΥΤΟΝΚΑΙΤΟΣΕΚΓΟΝΟΣΕΝΣΤΕ[ΛΕ
 Ι]ΛΙΘΙΝΕΙΚΑΙΣΤΗΣΑΙΕΝΑΚΡΟΠΟΛ[ΕΙ
 Τ]ΙΟΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΑΤΗΣΒΟΛΗΣΕΠΙΜΕΙ[ΜΗΑ
 Π]ΗΓΕΛΕΤΟΙΣΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΙΣΠΕΡ[ΙΤΩΝ
 Ν]ΕΩΝΤΟΠΑΡΑΠΛΟΚΑΙΕΙΟΙΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΙΜ
 Η]ΕΠΙΘΟΝΤΟΕΑΛΩ[Σ]ΑΝΑΝΑ[Ι]ΣΙΤΗΓΟΙΩΣΕΝ
 ΑΙΠΟΛΕΜΙΟΙΑΝΤΙΤΟΥΤΩΝΕΝΑΙ[ΑΥΤΩΙΤ
 ΗΝΠΡΟΞΕΝΙΑΝΚΑΙΤΗΝΕΥΕΡΓΕΣΙ[ΑΝ
 Κ]ΑΙΚΑΛΕΣΑΙΑΥΤΟΝΕΠΙΞΕΝΙΑΕΙ[ΣΤΟΠ
 ΡΥΤΑΝΕΙΟΝΕΙΣΑΥΡΙΟΝΜΕΙΙΣΑ[Ι]ΔΕΤ
 ΟΑΡΓΥΡΙΟΝΤΟΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΝΤΟΣΑΠΟΔΕ
 ΚΤΑΣΕΚΤΩΝΚΑΤΑΒΑΛΛΟΜΕΝΩΝΧΡΗΜΑ
 ΤΩΝΕΠΕΙΔΑΝΤΑΕΚΤΩΝΝΟΜΩΝΜΕΡΙΣΩΣ

. . . τοῦ] δῆμ[ου Φαν]όκ[ριτου] τὴν εὐεργεσίαν ἀν[αγρ]άψαι ἐν στή-
λῃ λιθίνῃ εἰς [ἀκρ]όπολ[ιν,] κ[αλέσαι] δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ξέν[ια] εἰς τὸ πρυ-
τανεῖον εἰς αὐρίον.

Κέφαλος εἶπε, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ [τῇ] βουλῇ, ἀναγράψαι δὲ
Φανόκριτον τὸν Παριανὸν πρόξενον καὶ εὐεργ[έτην] αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς ἐκ-
γόνους ἐν στή[λῃ] λιθίνῃ, καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλ[ει] τ[ο] γογγραμματεῖα τῆς
βουλῆς· ἐπ[εῖ] εἰ [μὴ] ἀπ[ήγγειλε] τοῖς στρατηγοῖς περ[ὶ] τῶν ν[εῶν] τοῦ
παράπλου, καὶ εἰ οἱ στρ[ατηγοὶ μὴ] ἐπ[ύ]θοντο, ἐάλω[σ]αν ἂν α[ἱ] σι-
[τηγοί,] ὡς εἶν[αι] πολεμίσ[αν]. ἀντὶ τούτων εἶναι [αὐτῶ] τ[ὴν] προξενίαν
καὶ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν, κ[αὶ] καλέσαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ξένια εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον
εἰς αὐρίον. μερίσαι δὲ τ]ὸ ἀργύριον τὸ εἰρήμενον τοὺς ἀποδέκτας ἐκ
τῶν καταβαλλομένων χρημάτων, ἐπειδὴν τὰ ἐκ τῶν νόμων μερ[ίσω]-
σιν.

The beginning is the προβούλευμα of the βουλῇ. Cephalus moved that Phanocritus and his descendants should be recognised as πρόξενοι and εὐεργεταὶ of the Athenians, because his timely information had saved some transport vessels. Cephalus is mentioned, Æsch. c. Ctesiphon. and the transaction is alluded to Diod. xv. 34. Πόλλις ὁ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ναύαρχος, πυθόμενος σίτου πλῆθος ἐν ὁκάσιν παρακομίζεσθαι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ἐφῆδρευε καὶ παρετήρει τὸν κατάπλου τῆς κομιζομένης ἀγορᾶς, διανοούμενος ἐπιθεσθαι τοῖς ὁκάσιν· ἃ δὲ πυθόμενος ὁ δῆμος τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐξέπεμψε στόλον παραφυλάξοντα τὴν σιτοπομπίαν, καὶ διέπεμψεν εἰς τὸν Πειραιεῖα τὴν κομιζομένην ἀγοράν. The meaning of a passage in Plato Gorg. (p. 451, 15.) which neither the scholiast nor any translator seem to have understood, may be explained by reference to the words of this inscription, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα καθάπερ τῇ βουλῇ (δοκεῖ). This inscription was made soon after Euclides, and the transaction which is alluded to falls into Olymp. 100, 4.

Inscription 85 was found in the church of St. Nicolas at Athens. It reads thus :

Ἐξ οὗ Κέκροπα λαδὲς Ἀθηναίων ὀνομά[ζει]
καὶ χώραν Παλλὰς τήνδ' ἔκτισε δῆμω Ἀθηνῶν,
οὐδεὶς Σωσιβίου καὶ [Π]ύρ[ρ]α μεί[ζ]ονα θ[ε]ί[η]ν
φυλὴν Κεκροπιδῶν ἔρ[γ]ω ἔδρασε ἀγαθά.

Ἐδοξε τῇ Κεκροπιδι φυλῇ ἐπὶ Χαρισάνδ[ρου] ἀρχοντος
τῇ κυρίᾳ ἀγ[ο]ρᾷ, κρύβδ[η]ν ψηφισαμένων τῶν φυλετῶν ἐν ἀκρο-
πόλει.

Ὁνήτωρ Κηφισοδώρου Μελιτ[ε]ύς εἰ[πεν]· Ἐπειδ[ὴ] Πύρρ[ης] . . .
ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός.]

γεγέννητα[ι] περὶ τὴν φυλ[ὴ]ν καὶ τὰ κοιν[ά,] ἐπαινέσα[ι] αὐτὸν
ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν, καὶ]

Χρυσῶ στεφάνῳ ἀπὸ π[ε]ν[τα]κοσίων [στ]εφανῶσα[ι].

Charisander was archon, Olymp. 101, 1. The meeting of a φυλή was called ἀγορά, that of the whole people ἐκκλησία. Κρύβδην ψηφισαμένων is explained by Boeckh as if the ψήφισμα had been in privilegio, since a φυλή decreed what usually could only be decreed in an assembly of the whole people. We doubt whether this be the meaning of κρύβδην, at least we do not remember any passage where it has such a meaning. If we knew the nature of the benefit, which the tribus Cecropia derived from Sosibius and Pyrrhe, we might probably also understand why the φυλεται κρύβδην ἐψηφίσαντο.

Inscription 88 was found at Hælæ near Zoster: the stone is in the Museum at Paris. Euthemon proposed that the magistrates of the demus should give accounts of the public revenue.

Εὐδήμων εἶπεν· ὅπως ἂν σῶαι ᾧσι αἱ πρόσδο[οι τοῖς δημόταις καὶ τὸν λόγον καλῶς δι]δῶσιν οἱ δήμαρχοι καὶ [οἱ ταμίαι δεδ]όχθαι τοῖς δημόταις· [διδόναι τῆς προσδό]δου τοὺς ταμίαις τὸν λόγον, τὰν τε προσιόντων] καὶ τῶν ἀναλωμάτων· ἐ[ξελεῖν δὲ αὐτοὺς τὴν] κιβωτὸν κατὰ τὸν μην[α . . . ἐὰν δὲ οἱ νῦν] δὴ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ Ναυσιγέ[νους μὴ ἀπολόγι]σων]ται ἐθέλονται ἐμβα[τεῦσαι . . . κατὰ τὸν λόγον τὰςδε ε. ι. . .δοι [ύ]στέρῳ ἔτει πρὸ [τῆς δεκάτης . . .] τοῦ . . . ἰῶνος μηνός ἐκ τῶν ἐκάστου . . . γραμματεῖαν, ἐξ ἄλλων δὲ μὴ . . . στή[σαι δὲ τοὺς ταμίαις ἐν τ]ῇ ἀγορᾷ ἀναγρ[αφὴν . . . κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα. ἐξορκούτο [δὲ ὁ δήμαρχος τὸν εὐ]θυνον καὶ τοὺς πα[ρέδρους ὁ δήμαρχος κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ ἐ]γγεγραμμένον ἐὰν δὲ . . . οἱ τα[μίαι μὴ ἐξέλωσι τὴν κιβωτόν . . . the end is lost. Ἐμβατεύειν means to take possession of a mortgage, whether it be a house or landed property.

Inscription 93 is an important document of a lease of land for forty years, entered into between the community of Æxone and two private individuals. The stone is in the public Museum at Leyden.

Κα[τά] τὰδε ἐμισθωσαν Λίξανεις τὴν φιλοεῖδα Αὐτοκλεί Αὐτέου καὶ Αὐτέα Αὐτοκλείους τετταράκοντα ἔτη ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα δυοῖν δραχμῶν ἕκαστον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν, ἐφ' ᾧτε καὶ φυτεύοντα καὶ ἄλλον τρόπον ὃν ἂν βούλωνται· τὴν δὲ μίσθωσιν ἀποδιδόναι τοῦ Ἐκατομβαιῶνος μηνός· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδιδῶσιν, εἶναι ἐνεχυρασίαν Λίξονεῦσιν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὠραίων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ χωρίου καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων τοῦ μὴ ἀποδιδόντος. μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ Λίξονεῦσιν μήτε ἀποδόσθαι μήτε μισθῶσαι μηδενὶ ἄλλῳ, ἕως ἂν τὰ τετταράκοντα ἔτη ἐξέλθῃ. ἐὰν δὲ πολέμιοι ἐξείργωσι ἢ διαφθείρωσιν τι, εἶναι Λίξονεῦσιν τῶν γενομένων ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ τὰ ἡμίσεα. ἐπειδὴν δὲ τὰ τετταράκοντα ἔτη ἐξέλθῃ παραδούναί τοὺς μεμισθωμένους τὴν ἡμισίαν τῆς γῆς χέρρον καὶ τὰ δένδρα ὅς' ἂν ᾖ ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ. ἀμπελοργὸν δ' ἐπάγειν Λίξονείας τοῖς ἔτεσι τοῖς τελευταίοις πέντε. χρόνος ἄρχει τῆς μισθώ[σεως] τοῦ Δημητρίου καρποῦ Εὐβουλος ἀρχων, τοῦ δὲ ξυλλίνου ὁ μετ' Εὐβουλον· τὴν δὲ μίσθωσιν ἀναγράφαντας

εἰς στήλας λιθίνας τοὺς ταμίαις τοὺς ἐπὶ Δημοσθένους δημάρχου στήσαι τὴν μὲν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἥβης ἔνδον τὴν δ' ἐν τῇ λίσσῃ καὶ ὄρους ἐπὶ τῷ χωρίῳ μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ τρεῖς ποδας ἐκατέρωθεν δύο. καὶ ἐὰν τις εἰσφορὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ χωρίου γίγνηται εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Αἰξωνέας εἰσφέρειν, ἐὰν δὲ οἱ μισθωταὶ εἰσενέγκωσι, ὑπολογί[ζεσθαι εἰς τὴν μίσθωσιν. τὴν δὲ γῆν τὴν ἐκ τῆς γεωρυχίας μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἐξάγειν μηδεμι[α] ἀλλ' ἢ εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ χωρίον. ἐὰν δὲ τις εἴπῃ ἢ ἐπιψηρίσῃ παρὰ τὰςδε τὰς συνθήκας πρὶν τὰ ἔτη ἐξελθεῖν τὰ τετταράκοντα, εἶναι ὑπόδικον τοῖς μισθωταῖς τῆς βλάβης.

Ἐπεοκλῆς Σκάωνος Αἰξωνεύς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ οἱ μισθωταὶ τῆς Φιλαεῖδος, Αὐτοκλῆς καὶ Αὐτέας συγχωροῦσιν ὥστε ἐκκόψαι τὰς ἐλάας Αἰξωνεύσιν, ἐλέσθαι ἄνδρας οἵτινες μετὰ τοῦ δημάρχου καὶ τῶν ταμιῶν καὶ τοῦ μισθωτοῦ ἀποδώσονται τὰς ἐλάας τῷ τὸ πλεῖστον δίδοντι· τοῦ δὲ εὐρόντος ἀργυρίου λογισάμενοι ἐπὶ δραχμῇ τὸν τόκον, τὸν ἡμ[ι]ον ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μισθώσεως καὶ ἐγγράψαι ἐν ταῖς στήλαις τοσούτων ἐλάττω τὴν μίσθωσιν, τοῦ δὲ ἀργυρίου τῆς τιμῆς τῶν ἐλαῶν λαμβάνειν Αἰξωνέας τὸν τόκον· τὸν δὲ πριάμενον τὰς ἐλάας ἐκκόψαι, ἐπειδὰν Ἀνθίας τὸν καρπὸν κομίσῃται τὸν μετ' Ἀρχίαν ἄρχοντα, πρὸ τοῦ ἀρότου. καὶ μύκητας καταλιπεῖν μὴ ἔλαττον [π]αλα[σ]τιαίους ἐν τοῖς περιχυτρίσμασιν, ὅπως ἂν αἱ ἐλάαι ὡς κάλλισται καὶ μέγισται γίγνονται ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἔτεσι. ἤρεθσαν ἀποδόσθαι τὰς ἐλάας Ἐπεοκλῆς, Ναύσων, Ἀγνόβεος.

The inscription belongs to Olymp. 108, 4. when Eubulos was archon. The demos of Φιλαῖς was situated between Æxone and Mount Hymettus. No rent (μίσθωσις) is to be paid in case the enemy should invade the country, but half of the produce is to be given up instead of it. It is provided by express stipulations how the land is to be left at the termination of the lease. Five years before the lease runs out, the community of Æxone have a right to appoint an ἀμπελουργός, to take care that the vine should be kept in a proper state. Olive-trees may be cut down, but it was contrary to common law to destroy them entirely, ἐκπρεμνίζειν; for a μύκης (stipes, truncus) of a certain height must be left. (Olive-trees are the most valuable part of landed property in Attica: the custom still prevails, when a daughter is given away, to value her property by the number of olive-trees which she brings to her husband.) It is also worth noticing, that the wood is to be sold to the highest bidder, τῷ τὸ πλεῖστον δίδοντι: and altogether this inscription is, with its complicated and judicious stipulations, a most curious specimen of a contract for a lease from those early times.

CLASSICAL AND PHILOLOGICAL EXTRACTS

From the Works of SAMUEL PARR, LL.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Curate of Hatton, &c.; with Memoirs of his Life and Writings, and a Selection from his Correspondence. By JOHN JOHNSTONE, M.D. Fellow of the Royal Society, and of the Royal College of Physicians of London, &c. In 8 vols. 8vo. London: Longman and Co.

"THERE is a passage in a fragment, preserved by Dionysius, which I cannot construe; it is this, *ἡβουλόμεν μὲν μὴ λίαν οὕτως ἀγνοηθέντα πρόσχημα ἔχειν αὐτοῖς*. The words give me no distinct idea. Can you assist me in explaining them?"—[Sir W. Jones to Dr. Parr. Vol. 1, p. 109.]

"I rejoice that your situation is agreeable to you; and only grieve that you are at such a distance from London. You speak well in your letter of your Dean. Yet I have been told that you are engaged in a controversy with him: Oh! MY FRIEND, REMEMBER AND EMULATE NEWTON, WHO ONCE ENTERED INTO A PHILOSOPHICAL CONTEST, BUT SOON FOUND, HE SAID, 'THAT HE WAS PARTING WITH HIS PEACE OF MIND FOR A SHADOW.' SURELY THE ELEGANCE OF ANCIENT POETRY AND RHETORIC, THE CONTEMPLATION OF GOD'S WORKS AND GOD'S WAYS, THE RESPECTABLE TASK OF MAKING BOYS LEARNED AND MEN VIRTUOUS, MAY EMPLOY THE FORTY OR FIFTY YEARS YOU HAVE TO LIVE MORE SERENELY, MORE LAUDABLY, AND MORE PROFITABLY, THAN THE VAIN WARFARE OF CONTROVERSIAL DIVINITY, OR THE DARK MINES AND COUNTERMINES OF UNCERTAIN METAPHYSICS.¹ Whether the *ἀριστοῦα* have been assigned to me in Wales I know not; but the knowledge of men which I have acquired in my short forensic career, has made me satisfied with my present station, and all my *φιλοτιμία* is at an end."—[Ibid. Vol. 1, p. 110.]

The attack on Pitt contains one curiosity. Amid the fine writing and learned quoting, are some iambics from the pen of Parr, interweaving the sentiments of Shakspeare with an Epigram of Epicharmus,² and delineating the character of Pitt. If they were not the ground, they may be supposed to have given the hint, for the establishment of the Porson prize in the University of Cambridge.

*Ψυχρὸν κέαρ τοῦ παιδίου θερμοῖς ἐπὶ
'Τόαρές τέ πως καὶ λεπτὸν αἶμα' αἰεὶ τρέφον
Νήφειν τ' ἀπιστεῖν τ' ἄρθρα τοῦ βίου λέγει,
'Αγέλαστον, ἔφιλον κάπροσῆγορον τέρας.*

¹ These are golden sentences; and it is ever to be regretted that they were so often forgotten by our revered friend.

² Bentl. ad Mill. p. 17.

It may be asked, Cui bono was all this written? What cause of provocation had Parr? I know of none, except the general disappointment of his party, and the unmannerly oaths of Thurlow. For, in the Notes to Rapin, he speaks with hope of Pitt, and does not upbraid him. But, if the censures were just, were they generous and wise? What business had he to call names in Greek, and to lead with insult those whom he hated *only* politically? This was the observation of Thurlow.—[Vol. 1, p. 206.]

Samueli Parrio, S. P. D. Immanuel Bekkerus.

Indignari te arbitrabar, vir venerande, silentii mei diuturnitatem, qui post singularia tua in me officia annum totum sine ulla litterula observantiae et amoris teste prætermissem. Tu vero ne indignare. Neque enim defuit mihi, quem deesse nefas sit, animus dierum apud te jucundissime actorum cum pietate et desiderio memor, virtutumque tuarum ipso aspectu et brevissimo usu manifestarum admirator: defuit otium et tranquillitas. Cum enim redux incidissem in tempora publice privatimque gravissima, quæ me ad vos rejecissent, si ullus in museis vestris homini peregrino locus pateret, feci quod reliquum esse videbam, ut mente a rerum externarum tædio avocata, et in bonarum artium studiis defixa temperarem a querelarum frustra nec tuto jactandarum impotentia, quæ ægritudinem nec levaret, et cum amicis meis communicaret. Id consilium an cum aliquo ad litteras fructu ceperim, tu existimabis, quando Thucydides meus et oratorum Atticorum volumen primum ad te deferentur; id quod spero hac ætate fieri posse. Existimabis autem humanius quam severius, neque ab homine male vexato rerumque suarum jamdudum pertæso, eam posces operis absolutionem et perfectionem, quam assequi soleat animus, liber, erectus, curis invictus, talis denique qualem tuum cognovi.

Vale, vir præstantissime, et me, ut amabas, ama.

Scrib. Berolini, A.D. 21, Julii, a. 1821.

Samueli Parrio, viro summe reverendo, S. D.

Godfredus Hermannus.

Magnopere gavisus sum, Parri, vir summe reverende, quum quod prius a Barkero acceperam, a Gesenio, qui te valde laudat, et Bohtio confirmatum vidi, bene te mihi velle, et in multis rebus mecum consentire. Non potest enim mihi non esse gratissimum, amicum et consentientem habere virum, quem omnes in litteris antiquis primum esse factentur. Accessit autem quasi cumulus gaudio meo, quum cognovi consentire nos etiam aliis in rebus, quam in solis litteris. Nam quum tu, ut ex Gesenio audivi, Reginæ partes in infelici illa lite acerrime tuereris, scias velim me quoque, quum etiam hic duæ essent factiones, plerisque culpantibus Reginam, paucis defendentibus, in his fuisse, qui eam strenue defenderent. Itaque quod his litteris adjeci exemplum Trachiniarum, si exiguum a se ipso habet, aliquam velim ab animo meo commendationem habere, qui tibi etiam ob illam consensionem deditissimus est. Vale. D. Lipsiæ d. xix. Maii a c1810ccccxii. [Vol. 1, p. 288.]

Dr. Parr to the Rev. H. Homer.

"With all his absurdities, Bentley is still the first critic; and yet you give no one note from him. Good God! you ought to know all his criticisms, and have them ad unguem, right or wrong. For whichever they be, they are instructive: but how to use them is the question. I

tell you you must follow your own judgment; you know I offered to examine my own Bentley, and mark it. In short, you are vastly learned about typography and paper, and so on, which is all very well; and I am disposed to flog you both for every thing else. To leave out Bentley, and to let that French Sanadon in, who understood very little more Latin than Bishop Hurd, and was as great a coxcomb! My dear Harry, everybody reads Horace for his sense, and may get some of it. But as to his Latin, very few understand it indeed. In short, I am all over wrath with you, and this *gentleman* idea will ruin you; for I shall say of you, as the King of Prussia did of the English in the American war, 'for scholars too little, and for gentlemen too much.' Now mind, yours is a Variorum Edition; your judgment in one respect is, and in another is not, decided. It is decided, so far as you collect what appear to you the best readings, and the best notes. It is not decided, unless you choose to make it so, when the notes you produce are at variance with each other. This is plain, and this is true. Now I come to advice; and if it is not followed I will not look at one more syllable. Get Bentley's Horace on every various reading which he states; collect as well as you can how many editions, or Mss., or critics, read this way or that; compare him also on every passage with Cunningham. You must abridge even to dwarfishness every giant note; but give what Bentley says in substance; and moreover, where you assent to his interpretation, or at least think it plausible, then produce it concisely. Now, for instance, on the 7th line of Ode 1, I should quote Bentley's note from mobilium down to scholastes; then I should draw a line and quote his interpretation and authorities from *differe* down to vulgus. Again (and pray, dear Harry, mind what I am saying), it is often worth while, even where you don't immediately quote any part of a note, yet to mark some curious canon, and introduce under the passages which he quotes in some other Ode. Now, I will give you two instances: you do not read with Bentley, *nobilis* evehere, and you are right. No, but you will, by and by, come to *impotens sperare*, in the 37th Ode; and then I should quote what Bentley has written in this note, beginning *Non loquendi genus*, and ending at *status*. Again, you ask about *rubente*; nor is it too late for you to print any thing in vindication of this spelling. But Bentley, in a note on another verse of this Ode, says, Horace is fond of *te* in preference to *ti*, where the verse admits, and though his note be on verse 31, I should have quoted it from *illud*, leaving out *deinde* down to the first reference; and I tell you once for all, that your edition may be made valuable by collecting and abridging the readings noticed and the phraseologies explained by this great man. All I can say is, that if you command me I will instantly look through my Horace, and bring it up with me. Moreover, at almost every line I read I panted, and was ready to burst, to make some remark of my own. I have marked with a pencil several various Greek passages, produced by none of the critics, which you also might have produced. This being work of the head, would employ me every day, and I cannot do so. I am afraid of your using Davy's (Gesner) book till I have seen it. Again, shall I from my philological books collect, before I come to town, conjectural readings on Horace, scattered in my book? This alone will require more leisure than I have before Easter. The note Linn. on *Hedera* I don't understand. Again, on me or *te* Bishop Hare has written; and I want to detect Hare, whom all the Etonians quote, in having pillaged

almost every one of his emendations in his famous Letter to Dr. Bland, that is, famous among the Etonians. Again, Klotzius understands *dominos terrarum* in opposition with *Deos*, and so do I with your reading and punctuation. But my own opinion of the passage is different; and I am sure few people will be the wiser for the notes on this passage. Now, you see Baxter says, *nobiles evehere is duriusculum*. Pray look at three passages, which Bentley quotes perfectly analogous. Yet you have left Baxter's nonsense uncontradicted. I could say fifty things more, but have said enough to frighten any reasonable man. I proceed to your spelling. *Mæcenas* is right—*quicquid* is right—*nunquam* is right—*permistus* is right—I prefer *hederæ*—always spell it *diis*—*rubente*, right—*literæ*, with a single *t*—*Etrusci* without the *H*—*sæculum* with a diphthong letter. Whatever spelling you adopt, be uniform; and, in adopting it, you must use your own judgment, or apply to me. I do not see justice done to the old reading of *nobilium*, though I do not admit it. In the text you must follow Gesner always. But you ought to have quoted Cunningham for *Olympium* beyond the mere various section. And again, though I think with Gesner about Columbus, yet I should have said a little more for *palumbis*. Different interpretations are not only not inconsistent with, but actually implied in, a good *Variorum* Edition. In giving Gesner's note you must omit nothing. The reader is to decide. Never mutilate Gesner. Receive Greek imitations and notice Grecisms.

In the Dedication there should be no stop at *sæculi*; and *nusquam* should be *nunquam*; and, for the sake of common sense, let there be some nominative case to the verb. What you mean by notes about syntax, I don't know. As to the double letter, it was written in a great hurry, and sent express to Stratford to catch the post. I say, finally, reprint the *Corrigenda*, and paste them on. Whether you do or do not cancel the obnoxious page I know not from your letter. But on one thing I insist, that, in reprinting for the purchasers of *Bellenden*, you print the passage softened. I also require of you to reprint the *Proem* for them, and to add what I have there proposed to be added about *Hastings*; and I have two or three more alterations, which I mean to make in the *Proem*, as *fervebat* for *laborabat*, p. 1; *ex rumoribus* for a *rumore*, p. 2; and to omit *lectorum* after *turba*; and in the addendum to print, at all events, *committam* rather than *efficiam*; and I now wish, having got rid of *efficiam*, to put *effutiam* instead of *effundam*; and several other things: for you will certainly take care to print *nihil attinet disputare*, and *est quædam similitudo*; and moreover, in the new matter about *Burke*, I prefer *operam dederit* to *se dedit*, though both are equally Latin.—To return to *Horace*. There are no prior marks, and every thing marked must be printed.—To return to *Bellenden*. If you think it worth while to reprint the last page of the *Proem*, insert what I write about *Hastings*; if you do not, then do not make that long addendum in the list of *corrigenda*. But, in the *corrigenda*, remember *cadit pati*; and moreover, when the whole of the *Proem* is reprinted, I repeat my injunction for the insertion of the passage about *Hastings*, as well as for the softened passage about *Novius*, who, with all his impudence, would, I think, be afraid of owing to a court that himself is the man meant, an ugly, bullying, old master. Be this as it may, I love safety, and I love decorum, and because I do so, I wish the leaf cancelled; first, we get rid of some errata; secondly, we can supply the *corrigenda* last, with *fervebat* for *laborabat*, and with

cadit pati for cadere solent, which cadere solent must, must, must be corrected, but not noticed, or it may be noticed in the new list of corrigenda; and mind, Harry, two things, which belong to me and not to you. First, I understand Latinify; and secondly, I am answerable for it.—To return to Horace. The first note from Cruq. is nonsense, for ut qui refers to Horace, who is never mentioned in the note. Secondly, Varietas et Poetica I barely understand. Thirdly, sit, in Lambin's note, p. 7, should be est, if Lambin did not himself blunder; however, do you print est. Torrentius is a good scholar, and his notes in my hands might be turned to account. But beware of that rascal Sanadon, and be-sure to quote what Klotzius says of him, and I say too. But why do you go on without Janus? Burney will lend you the edition."—[Vol. 1, p. 412.]

I owe to the kindness of His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex the following sarcastic character of Parr, by Sir William Jones :

"Ἔστι δέ τις ὃν καλῶς διορίζεσθαι οὐκ εὐμαρές· ἅπασιν γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνόμοιος ὢν, αὐτὸς αὐτῷ ἀνομοιάτατα καὶ λέγων καὶ ποιών φανερός ἐστιν. Ἀμέλει τοιοῦτος ὅστις τις οἷος σφόδρῳ καὶ μέτρῳ περ ὢν, ὅμως χλιδῇ παντοδαπῇ καὶ τρυφῇ ξηαιρέτος ἀγάλλεσθαι, καὶ τῶν οἶνων πλεῖν, ὅσα εἶδη τιμαλφέστατα, καὶ τῶν πλακοῦντων φάγειν, ὅσους ἡδίστους, καὶ καθεύδειν μαλθακῶς, καὶ λέχος κοκκινοβαφές ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀβάπτου προαιρεῖσθαι, καὶ δῶν ἀνθ' ἐνός. Καὶ πρῶτος μὲν ἦβει ἐρεσχελεῖν καὶ φιλονεϊκῶς ἔχειν καὶ ἐρίειν, τὰς δὲ ἐρίδας ἀγαθὴν κοινωνίαν ὀνομάζειν, καὶ λέγειν ὡς χρη τοὺς βαρβάρους ἅπας, ὥσπερ φαλάγγια παρῶν ἀπαθεῖσθαι καὶ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀφανισθῆναι, καὶ ὡς δεῖ ἅπαξ τῶν πέντε ἐτῶν τὸν ἐν πολιτείᾳ πρωτεύοντα πελεκίεσθαι, οὐχ ὡς πονηρὸν ὄντα ἀλλ' ὅτι πρωτεύει· ἥδη δὲ καὶ πλείους ἢ τετταράκοντα ἑξήκοντα μνημονεύειν οὐδ' ἀποπνίγεσθαι φησὶ δεῖν, καὶ τοῦ ἐπιτρίπτου τίνος δένδρῳ ἐσσηκῶς συνθεωρεῖν, καὶ λογιέσθαι πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, ἐκ τίνος ἂν δένδρου ὁ κεκτημένος εὐσχημονεσάτως κρέμασθαι, καὶ τὸν βρόχον φάναι πάντων νοσημάτων ἴασιν πορεύεσθαι, καὶ τὴν τοῦ δημοκρίτου τέχνην ἀκριβεστάτως ἐπίσταναι, καὶ περὶ τῶν πεπελεκισμένων καὶ κεκρεμασμένων ὀνομαστὶ μέμνησθαι, καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δημίου ἀπομνημόνευμα συχνάκις ἀναγινώσκειν, καὶ δίκην ὠφληκῶς τὸν δικαστὴν βούλεσθαι κρεμάνειν· καὶ περὶ τοὺς λόγους διωδὺς ἂν τραγικὸν τι τῇ δεξιᾷ κροτεῖν· καὶ σοβάρην λαλεῖν, καὶ μεταξὺ ἱππαζόμενος διαγωνίζεσθαι καὶ διαμψισθῆναι, ἱππῳ τῷ τεταλαιπωρημένῳ διὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ λέγειν δεινότητα πληγὰς ἐκτίνειν, καὶ τὸ ὅλον κωδωνίζειν δυνατὸς, καὶ παρονομάζειν, καὶ δισκεύειν, καὶ ταυροκοπεῖν, καὶ τραγηματίζεσθαι, καὶ αἰλουρον θρέψαι, καὶ τρίγυσμον τριγγίζειν, καὶ ἑαυτὸν λαυθάνειν τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρων.—[Vol. 1, p. 477.]

The mention of John Baines, who is also one of the worthies of the Spital Sermon, induces me to add the note made by Parr on the only two letters in the collection relating to his family, and a copy of Greek verses. It appears from the inscription that Mr. Baines died at the early age of twenty-nine.

He had few equals in learning and genius, and yet fewer in virtue and genuine piety. He was the intimate friend of Sir Samuel Romilly; he and John Tweddell were the brightest ornaments of Trinity College, Cambridge. Dr. Parr sent him the following verses inscribed in some book :

Τίς δὴ νομίζοι βαῦν' ἂν ὧδ' ἐπώνυμον
 Ἀλλοτρίοις σὺν ὀνομα συμφέρειν κακοῖς·
 Οὐ γὰρ βάναισος οὐδ' ἔχαρις ὢν τυγχάνεις,
 Ἀλλ' ἐν νόοις νέος τε κἂν γνωμῇ γέρον,
 ('Ὡς Πίνδαρος ποτ' εἶπε) τᾶριστεῖ ἔχεις
 Ἐν τοῖς Πλάτῳτος ὑπέροχος θρυλλουμένους.
 Πρὸς τὰ καλὰ κ' ἀγάθ' οὐδ' ἀκούεις εὐφυής;

Μνήμων, φιλομαθής, φιλόπονος, φιλήκοος,
 Ζητητικός, φιλότιμος, ἐστὶ θαυμ' ὄσον.
 Ὡς πάνσοφόν τι χρῆμά σ' ἔντ' ἰδίᾳ βλέπω.
 Πρὸς δ' αὖ τὰ καὶ α νή Δία κὰν ὑπερβολή.
 Φιλόδημος ἢ δὲ Φιλόπολις εἰ, σάφ' οἷδ' ὅτι
 Οὐ γάρ τι νῦν τε κἀχθὲς ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ποτε
 Ἐλευθεροτρεπῶς ἐλευθεροστομῶν,
 Μύρια τὰ τῆς παρωλέθρου τυραννίδος
 Πάντων μέγιστον ἔχθος ἔχθαίρεις κακῶ.
 Τῶν δ' ὅδ' ἔχόντων, τοῦτό μου δῶρον λάβε
 Τὸ βίβλιον πολυμαθὲς ἀνδρὶ πολυμαθεῖ,
 Ἀρετῆς τε τῆς σῆς τῆς τ' ἐμῆς Φιλίας χάριν.
 Ὑγλαυε, χαῖρ', εὖ πράττε πάντα πανταχοῦ.

Hæc *en παρέργῳ* lusit, qui te juvenem optimarum artium, optimarum partium, summo amore *σπουδαίως* atque ex animo complectitur, S. PARR. *Dabam Norwici, 16 Cal. Jan. 1783.* [Vol. 1, p. 557.]

Dr. Parr has left other classical compositions behind him besides those already enumerated.

There are Greek verses on Bishop Horsley, with Latin and English translations, which have been long circulated among scholars. The topic on which they turn is the Bishop's assertion in the House of Lords, that "laws were made to be obeyed, not dissuaded, by the people."

The Greek alone follows :

Αὐτὸν γραφῶν κήρυκα τῶν θείων σοφῶν
 Ἰπποκτον εἶναι φησὶ καὶ διδάσκαλον,
 Καὶ δῆλός ἐστι κοινὰ ποικίλλων ἔπη·
 Δεινὸς φλυαρεῖν καὶ φευακίζειν ὄχλον -
 Παλαίσμασιν χαίροντα, καὶ τύφῳ κενῷ.
 Βουλῇ δὲ μυχθεὶς τοῖς βεβῶσιν ἐν τέλει,
 Τοῖς μὲν σοφισταῖς, τοῖς δὲ μηχανορράφοις,
 "Ἐλεξεν, ὑπὲρ τοῖς δυναμένοισιν ὦν αἰεὶ,
 "Διχόμυθα," λοξῶς σκληρὰ συγκαλλῶν καλοῖς·
 Νεωστὶ δ' ἀγορευόντος ὃδ' εἶχεν βρόμος·
 "Κοινῇ μέλειν μὲν πλουσίοις κοινῶν ὄπερ,
 "Τοῖς γ' εὖ φρονούσι τῇ γαθῇ τάξει μόνοις,
 "Πόλεως μόνοις τ' οἶακα νομῶν αἰδόσι,
 "Μόνοις τε γῆν σῶζουσιν ἐν χρεῖας ἀκμῇ·
 "Πένητα δ' αὖ δεῖν σχέτλιον στέργειν βίον,
 "Καὶ μὴ βλέπειν βλέποντα, μηδὲ πον κακῶν
 "Κλύοντ' ἀκούειν, μηδὲ πάσχοντα στέρειν.
 "Ἄλλ' ἤσυχον, ταπεινὸν, αὐτουργόν τ' αἰεὶ,
 "Ἰσως δικαίους καδίκους αἰνεῖν νόμους,
 "Ἐᾶν τ' ἀπηνεῖς, οὐδ' ὑπευθύνους κρατεῖν.
 "Τὸν δ' ἀγρίως ὀκνοῦντα μὴ οὐ ποιεῖν τάδε,
 "Ἀσχίστα καὶ τάχιστα μαυθάνειν, ὅσῳ
 "Αὐθαδίας ἔμεινον ἢ πειθαρχία,
 "Ὅσον τε χειρωναξίαν νικᾷ γένος,
 "Ὅσῳ τε πένης πλουτὸς ἐστ' ὑπερφέρων,
 "Χῶσον τό τ' ἔρχειν καὶ τὸ δουλεῖν δίχα."
 Οὕτω μὲν ἀνὴρ, ἀδυρλόγηστος ἐν λόγοις,
 Ἠλευθεροτόμησε, καὶ πίσυνος θράσει,
 Βλοσυρόφρονι χλιδῇ τε, καὶ σκυθρῷ δέθει,
 Κατεφρόνησε δημοτῶν— "τὰ δ' ὅμματα
 "Φαίδρου" ἔθηκε τοῖσι βασιλέως φίλοις·

"Τὸ γὰρ γένος τοιαῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν εὐτυχῆ
 "Πηδῶσ' ἀεὶ κήρυκας, ὅδε δ' αὐτοῖς φίλος
 "Ὅς ἂν δόνηται, πόλεος ἐν τ' ἀρχαῖσιν ᾖ."

VERSES ON PHRYNE.

Φρύνην λοιδορίας ὀβρίσας, καὶ δευὰ βοήσας,
 "Ῥήτωρ τις μόνον οὐκ ἤγαγεν εἰς Αἶδου"
 Τοῦ γὰρ ὑπαχθέντες γλώσσης βελέεσσι δικάσται
 Παῖδ' ἂν θήσαιεν τλήμονα πρὸς στανίδι.
 "Ἦδε κάτω βλέψασα κριτῶν παρὰ ποσσὶν ἐκέϊτο
 Σιγῇ, καὶ πολλὰς ἐξεδάμυνσε χέρας.
 Μάχον δ' ἐξέφερεν, θάμβος δ' ἔχεν εἰσορόωντας,
 Καὶ θέλξας ἔλαθεν πενκαλίμους ἔλεος.
 Τοῖον ἀπὸ στηθῶν ἀπαλῶν ἐστὶ λιβέτο κάλλος,
 Καὶ τοῖον πειθοῦς δμμασιν ἄνθος ἐν ἡν.
 Οὕτως ἢ φεύγουσ' ἀποφεύγειν Παρθένος ᾗδει,
 'Ἢ γυρνή νικᾷ, ἢ τ' ἀκέουσα λέγειν."

There was also a Greek Epithalamium on the marriage of Dr. Charles Burney, of which I have no copy.

The Episcopal Gallery is another composition of Dr. Parr, esteemed by him the child of his old age, and nursed with parental tenderness. I shall copy the beginning and the end as specimens of his skill in writing English poetry. He had not practice enough to write smoothly, and perhaps he thought too vigorously to be a good versifier.

GALLERY OF DIGNITARIES,

By EPISCOPUS EPISCOFORUM.

In the Epilogue to his Epistles, Pope writes thus:

"E'en in a Bishop I can spy desert;
 Secker is decent, Rundle has a heart;
 Manners, with candor, are to Benson given,
 To Berkeley ev'ry virtue under heaven."

Keeping these verses in view, δ δεινὰ sketched a rough outline of his opinion of the Prelates of our own time.

In Bishops I can see and praise desert;
 Burgess is learned, Bathurst has a heart;
 Lambeth and York two well-bred Prelates grace;
 Nor pride, nor selfishness, in Van I trace.
 King mild and noiseless o'er his Church presides,
 Nor basely for translation changes sides.
 Taste charms in Howley, science Kaye explores,
 And each of learning has abundant stores.
 To Lambeth's turrets well may one aspire,
 And London's mitre raise the other higher.
 Grey hairs to Buckner are a crown of glory,
 And Majendie is pleasant, though a Tory.
 A scholar, free from pedantry or spleen,
 In thee, kind-hearted Huntingford, is seen.
 Unsoil'd by courts, and unseduced by zeal,
 Fisher endangers not the public weal.

True piety in Ryder I admit,
 Manners in Pelham, and in Cornwall wit.
 Turn we to Exon, Lichfield, and Cartisle,
 None frown indignant, some approving smile.
 To Law and Legge candor and sense are given,
 Bright gems on earth, and surest lights to heaven.

Yet some there are whose merits I proclaim,
 As shedding lustre on a Patron's name.
 Thy virtues, B——s, consecrate the choice,
 And favored P——y wins the public voice.
 Talent in P——t would more brightly shine
 With less prostration at his Idol's shrine;
 Why hurls he curses at the Church of Rome,
 And strives to thwart a Patriot's views at home?
 Why, but to prop his Patron's tottering fame,
 His weakness flatter, and his favor claim?
 Prelates of ages past, whom, blest above,
 Nor praise nor censure from this earth can move;
 Martyrs who form'd our Church in days of old,
 Cranmer the mild, and Latimer the bold;
 And later Sages, whom, to science rear'd,
 True moderation to the good endear'd;
 Omniscient Taylor, spotless Tillotson,
 Hoadly the calm, and dauntless Warburton,
 Brave Watson, steady Shipley, Law profound,
 And Newcome, midst the best and wisest found;
 Pour forth your prayers before th' Almighty throne,
 To guard those altars which were once your own:
 Long may your writings charm our rising youth,
 And point the way to wisdom and to truth;
 Long your example their affections guide,
 From mean ambition far, and far from pride;
 Long may our Church teach Kings what Kings should be,
 And form a people worthy to be free;
 And long our Pastors, faithful to their Lord,
 Receive in heavenly bliss their just reward.

[Vol. 1, p. 746.]

“Concerning Inscription-writing, my opinions are founded on a diligent and critical inspection of what has been published by Sponius, Reinesius, Fabretti, Gruter, Muratorius, and Marcellus. The latter has written one of the most elegant and judicious books I ever read: and he moreover has published a volume of Inscriptions written by his own pen, in conformity to his own rules. None of the common classical writers are of much use; and indeed I venture on monumental phraseology, for which no example is to be found in their works.”

So says DR. PARR himself.

The Inscriptions are arranged according to the dates of composition.

Die Veneris septimam ad horam Id. Jun.
 Mortem sibi invitum contulit catapulta
 Nimirum icu confectus

CAROLUS WILLIAMS, Scholæ Etonensis olim alumnus
Trin. Aul. Cant. tantum Socio-commensalis
Anno Domini M.DCC.LXVI. ætatis suæ xx.
Fortuna juvenis amplissimus
Forma pulcherrimus
Moribus optimus
Vixit omnibus amabilis
Cecidit omnibus defendendus
Die Lunæ sequenti Templo Sancti Edwardi
Inhumatus est circum horam undecimam
G. Hallifax LL. Professore et Collegii ipsius
Tutore preces legente.

✠
THOMAS NELSON, A. M.
Vir frugi integerrimus
Sacerdotibus in hac ecclesia muneribus
In exemplum perfunctus
Et de successoribus suis quorum reditus
Augendos curaverat B. M.
Decessit prid. Non. Octob.
Anno Sacro M.DCC.LXX.
Ætat. suæ LXI.

Est hic liber
Multiplici doctrina
Puraque etiam pietate plenissimas
Viro rum continet optimorum
De rebus gravissimis
Genuinas (uti aiunt) atque
Ακρίβηλους
Sententias quas profecto et mihi
Semper cordi fuerunt
Præceptisque Christi ipsius
Aptissime congruunt
Tert. Kal. Nov. M.DCC.LXXXIII.

FREDERICO COMMERELL
Viro probo miti omnibus affabili
Qui
Heilbranni in Germania honesta stirpe oriundus
Et inter Angliæ cives conscriptus
Res mercatorias
Diligenter et fideliter administravit
Ruri tranquille placideque consenuit
Diem supremum obiit
Pridie Id. April.
Anno Christi M.DCC.LXXXVIII.
Ætat. suæ LXXXII.
Et sepultus est in hoc templo
Quod pie sancteque
Vivas frequentaverat
Joannes Gulielmus Commerell
Filius superstes
Patri bene merenti
H. M. poni curavit.

FELICI VAUGHAN

Coll. Jesu Cantabr. olim alumno
Viro inter amicos comi urbano simplici
Causarum actori disertio
Et legum Anglicarum eximie perito
Libertatis vindici acerrimo
Justitiæ veritatisque
Sancto et sincero cultori.

EDMUNDO BURKE

Viro
Multis et exquisitis litteris imbuto
Et summa ingenii prædito gloria
Sodali
Suis amabili
Et in omni genere facetiarum ornatissimo
Civi
Qui rempublicam propriam Britannorum
Idcirco esse optimam statuebat
Quod regalis senatorii popularisque juris
Consensu fundata esset
Et communione utilitatis stabilita
Critico
Qui e recondita vi verborum quotidianorum
Quod aut verum est
Aut ad id quam proxime accedit
Acute arguteque elicuit
Intimos quosdam animi sensus patefecit
Et adumbratas in eodem a natura
Rerum imagines
Multo expressiores definiendo et explicando reddidit
Philosopho
Qui multiplices et abstrusas rei politicæ rationes
Cum disciplina morali conjunctas
Uberrime et gravissime illustravit
Oratori
Qui copiose erudite splendide dicendo effecit
Ut omnes artes se præberent
Comites eloquentiæ ac ministras
Qui vixit ann. LXXVII. mens. v. dies XXVII.
Decessit VIII. Id. Quintil. Anno Sacro M.DCC.LXXXVII.
Et Beaconsfieldiæ in agro Buckinghami
Sepultus est
Rex senatusque Britannicus
H. M. P. P. impen. ponendum jusserunt.

3

CATHARINE MACKINTOSH

Feminae pudicæ frugi piæ
Matrifamilias
Viri triumque filiarum
Quos superstites sui reliquit
Amantissimæ
Vixit ann. XXXII. mens. XI. dieb. XXI.
Fecit cum marito ann. VIII. mens. I. dieb. XXI.
Decessit sexto Id. April. Anno Sacro
M.DCC.XCVII.
Jacobus Mackintosh

Dr. Johnstone's *Life of Parr.* 321

H. M. con. B. M. P.
Sperans haud longinquum
Inter se et Catharismam suam
Digressam fore
Siquidem vitam nobis commemorandi diversorium
Non habitandi
Deus immortalis dedit.

EDUARDO BARETTI
Viro innocenti simplici integerrimo
Natura usuque acuto
Sale facetisque amicis jucundissimo
In susceptis consiliis gravi et constanti
Divitiarum non ut secum aut magnifice
Sed recte viveret
Modice cupido
Qui filiorum quos valde amavit
Trium superstes
Decessit xvi. Kalend. Decemb.
Anno sacro M.DCC.LXXXVIII.
Ætat. sue LXIII.
Conjugi B. M.
H. M. sua impensa
Faciendum curavit.

M. S.
In hac ecclesia conditorum
JOANNIS TWEDDELL qui ob. Frid. Octobr.
A.D. M.DCCC.V. æt. LXXV.
Et JANE TWEDDELL quæ ob. viii. Kal. August.
A.D. M.DCCC.II. æt. LV.
Itemque JOANNIS TWEDDELL
Filii eorum natu maximi
Et Colleg. Sacrosanct. Trinitat.
Apud Cantabrigienses
Socii qui Athenis ob. xiii. Kal. Decembr.
A.D. M.DCC.LXXXVIII. ætat. xxx.
Et in Templo Thesei ibidem sepultus est
Robertus Tweddell
Parentium et fratris carissimorum superstes
H. M. P. C.

2
Honoratis et nobilibus viris
DUNBAR et ALEXANDRO DOUGLAS
Filiis Dunbar Comitiss de Selkirk
Quorum hic
Dum in leg. xxxviii. pedibus merebat
Peste
Quæ in Gaudaloupiæ incolas ingruerat correptus
Ibi decessit vii. Id. Jun.
Anno Domini M.DCC.LXXXIV.
Ætat. xxvi.
Et ad stationem suam conditus est
Ille
A bello quod exarserat
Judicio quidem et voluntate abhorrens

Classical Extracts from

Sed ab religione officii militaris non declinans

Cum naviculae Anglice dictae

The Terror bomb-ketch praesesset

Et in morbi qui hanc insulam invaserat

Contagionem incidisset

Obiit iv. Kal. Novemb.

Anno Domini M.DCC.LXXXVI.

Ætat. xxviii.

Et hic situs est

Thomas Comet de Selkirk

Fratribus se natu majoribus

Et sibi carissimis

Hoc monumentum

Ponendum curavit

Anno Domini M.DCCC.

M. S.

JOSEPHUS WARTON

Etc.

Si quis alius

Inter egregios memorandi

Propter benevolentiam morum suavitatem

Omnibus dilecti

Amicis ob festivitatem sermonis

Animi candorem

In deliciis habiti

Scriptoribus antiquis simul

Atque recentioribus examinandis

Interpretandis imitandis

Vel doctorum judicio

Singularis scientiæ

Quanta insuper cum cura sequitate

Lenitate diligentia

Usque ad senectutem

Munere gravissimo informatoris

Perfunctus sit Wartonus

Hocce monumentum

Discipulorum impensis structum

Posteris testetur.

H. S. E.

JOSEPHUS WARTON, S. T. P.

Hujus ecclesiæ

Prebendarius

Scholæ Wintoniensis

Per annos fere triginta

Informator

Poëta fervidus facilis expolitus

Criticus eruditus perspicax elegans

Obiit xxiii. Feb. M.DCCC.

Ætat. LXXVIII.

Hoc qualecunque

Pietatis monumentum

Præceptoris optimo

Desideratissimo

Wilemici sui

P. CC.

JACOBUS JOHNSON
 Qui per annos XL.
 In agro Vigornensi
 Artem medicam peritissima exercebat
 Magnam ingenii et doctrinae famam
 Scriptis suis atque etiam inventis assecutus est
 Visit ann. LXXII.
 Decessit IV. Kal. Maii M.DCCC.II.
 Quinque liberi ejus superstites
 Patri de se optime merito
 H. M. F. CC.

M. S.
 GUIDONIS Comitis Verovicani
 Qui
 Postquam Danos
 Contra patriam ejus arma inferentes
 Devicerat
 Satisque bellicae gloriæ sibi comparaverat
 In cellam huic sediculæ vicinam
 Et a Sancto Dubritio antea habitatam
 Sua sponte se recepit
 Ut quo in loco cum consensceret
 Deo pie colendo se totum dedidisset
 In eodem casa ipsius
 Post mortem conderentur
 Imaginem hancce
 Ricardus Beauchamp Comes Verovicanus
 Regnante Henrico Sexto
 Poni curavit.

In hoc loco
 Quem Henricus Quintus inviserat
 Et ad Cantariam a se fundandam destinaverat
 RICARDUS BEAUCHAMP Comes de Warwick
 Regnante Henrico Sexto
 Capellam posuit
 Et annuis redditibus locupletavit
 Joannes Rous
 Cum in Collegium Capellanorum Clivi Guidonici
 Favente Edwardo Quarto cooptatus esset
 Chronicon suum de regibus Angliæ
 Ibidem conscripsit
 Aliosque item libros
 Qui olim deperditi sunt
 Aut in bibliothecis etiam nunc delitescunt
 Turrim propriis impensis extruendam curavit
 SAMUEL GREATHEED A.D. M.DCC.LXIV.
 BERTIE GREATHEED Samuelis filius
 Ediculum ipsam refecit
 A. D. M.DCCC.II.

THOMAS TWINING A. M.
 Hujusce ecclesiæ Rectori
 Viro in quo
 Doctrina inerat multiplex et recondita

Classical Extracts from

Ingenium elegans et sanctum
 Scribendi genus non exille spinosumque
 Sed accuratum et exquisitum
 In rebus quæ ad rem criticam pertinent explicandis
 Sermo sine aculeo et maledictis facetus
 Et sapore pæne proprio Athenarum imbutus
 Mansuetudo morum
 Et comitas suis perjucunda
 Pietas erga Deum pura atque sincera
 Siquidem honesta de ejus natura opinione
 Stabilisque in Christo fide
 Potissimum nixa est
 Et cum summa in omnes homines benevolentia
 Nanquam non conjuncta
 Ricardus Twining fratri carissimo
 Nato VIII. Kalend. Januar. A. S. M.DCC.XXXV.
 Mortuo VIII. Id. Aug. M.DCC.XIV.
 Condito Colocotron in sepulchro templi
 Ad Mile-End siti
 H. M. P. C.

Cani

Ex genere eorum
 Quibus Newfoundlandia nomen dedit oriundo
 Quondam tigri dicto
 Postea amico
 Narium sagacitate
 Oculorum acie
 Valida totius corporis coagmentatione
 Atque acerrimo animi vigore
 Ad omnia quæ præstare debuit
 Munera aptissimo
 Qui
 Ad virum antea ab ipso ne semel quidem visum
 Sed dominum brevi futurum
 Cum proluendi se gratia Portesmuthie
 In mare ultra quam oportebat
 Nec opinato progressus esset
 Tandique imperitus
 Et contra undarum impetum diu luctatus
 Viribus jam exhaustis
 Et gravi stupore sensibus oppressis
 Temere huc illuc super aquas fluitaret
 Sua sponte advolaverat
 Prensatumque crinibus
 Et ad litus cæste ac diligenter delatum
 Ex instanti mortis periculo eripuerat
 Gulielmus Philips
 Custodi domus fideli
 Et vitæ fortissimo conservatori
 Super ossa ejus senio emortui
 H. M. P. C.
 Anno Sacro M.DCCC.V.

GULIELMO PITT

Gulielmi Comitis de Chatham filio natu minori
 Georgii Tertii a Consiliis Secretis
 Publici Fisci Cancellario

Et principi *Ærarii* Procuratori
Qui *Idcirco* quod *indolem* habebat
In penetralibus clarissimi patris nutritam
Et in ipso *juventutis* flore
Admirabili quadam *vi ingenii* vigebat
Annum agens *vice*simum et quintum
Gradum honoris prope amplissimum obtineit
Et cum *incredibili* civium *sacrorum*
Comprobatione *republicam* capessivit
Oratori qui cum in *senatum* afferret
Luminosam *actuosamque* dicendi genus
Articulis et *membris*
Singulari *artificio* distinctum
Et *verborum* cum *varietate* et *copia*
Tum *completo* etiam et *perfecto* ambitu ornatum
Animi *motus* et ad *excogitandum* *celerem*
Et ad *memoriam* *firmos* et *disturnos*
Maximum in *voce* *splendorem*
Et *eximiam* in *gestu* *dignitatem*
Superbissimo *aurium* *satisfacere* *judicio*
Et *voluntates* *hominum* quo *vellet*
Flectere et *impellere* *potuit*
Dispensatori *publicæ* *pecuniæ*
Fideli et *apprime* *intelligenti*
Regis *populique* *Britannici*
Contra *nebulonum* *novis* *rebus* *studentium*
Præstigias et *effrenatum* *furorem*
Vigilanti *strenuoque* *vindicta*
Gallorum *quotquot* vel *argutarum* *tendiculis*
Fucatoque *eloquentiæ* *nitore*
Vel *tumultu* atque *armis*
Summa cum *infimis* *pænia* *facere*
Et *sacra* *profanis* *miscere* *conarentur*
Acerrimo *inimico*
Academici *Cantabrigiæ*
Doctissimo *amantissimoque* *alumno*
Ecclesiæ *Anglicæ*
Diligenti et *officioso* *fautori*
Homini qui à *divitiis* *conquirendis*
Manus *oculos* *mentem* *abstinuit*
Illecebris *blandæ* *voluptatis*
Deliniri *noluit*
Et *honoribus* *tot* tamque *amplis*
Quos in *adolescencia* *non* *solum* *datos* *sibi*
Sed *creditos* *quoque* et *commissos* *esse*
Existimaverat
Per *omne* *curriculum*
Industriæ et *constantis* *sue*
Dignissimum se *præstitit*
Amici *ejus* *academici*
Ex *ære* *collato*
Hanc *statuam* *ponendam* *curaverunt.*

GULIELMUS PITT
Aulæ *Pembrokianæ* quondam *alumnus*
Academici *hujusce* *sextum* *creatus* *burgensis*
A. D. M.DCCC.IV.
Seneschallus *ejusdem* *communi* *consensu* *factus*
A. D. M.DCCCLXXX.

Classical Extracts from

Scaccarii Cancellarius
 Dominus primarius Fisci
 Regis Majestati
 A Sanctionibus Conciliis et a Secretis
 Decessit decimo Kal. Febr. A. D. M.DCCC.VI.
 Ætat. XLVII.

Talis viri græte et pie memores
 Cantabrigienses omnium ordinum
 Collata pecunia posuerunt
 Anno Sacro M.DCCC.XII.

THOMÆ PERCIVAL
 Scriptori cujus opera permulta et perpolita
 Probitate ipsius et moribus
 Ad omnem memoriam commendata sunt.
 Medico rectissimis studiis
 Magnæque prudentia et exercitatione prædito
 Libertatis sine ullis verborum præstigiis
 Aut lubrica et præcipiti rerum novarum cupiditate
 Acerrimo vindici
 Morborum solerter atque humane curandorum
 Et vitæ sapienter honesteque instituendæ
 Doctissimo ac sanctissimo præceptori
 Qui vixit annos LXIII. menses XI. diem^{VI}.
 Decessit tertio Kalend. Septembr.
 Anno Sacro M.DCCC.V.
 Elizabeth Percival conjux ejus pientissima
 Et novem liberi superstites
 Patris de se optime meriti
 H. M. P. CC.

THOMÆ PERCIVAL
 Qui non solum ad Societatem Mancuniensem
 Constituendam
 Consilio hortatu auctoritate
 Incubuit
 Sed constitutam
 Animo erudito
 Scriptis elegantissimis
 Singulari morum comitate
 Multum et diu ornavit
 Sodales ejus superstites
 Hanc marmoream tabellam
 D. S. I.
 P. CC.

GEORGIO COMITI DE MACARTNEY
 Vice-Comiti de Dervock
 Baroni de Lisnacore et Parkhurst
 A sacris Georgio Tertio Britanniarum Regi
 Ordine equestri Aquilæ Argenteæ
 A Stanislaw Augusto Rege Poloniæ ornato
 Idemque apud Anglos suæ jussu regio
 In Ordinem Balnei scripto
 Qui
 Primum ad Ladoga Paludem

Deinde ad Occidentales Cycladas
 Postea in sacra Gangis Peninsula
 Præterea in Jovis Hammonis finibus
 Denique inter extremos Seras
 Magna et honestissima munera
 Prudenter strenue fideliter implevit
 Vixit annis LXIX. mens. VIII.
 Decessit Londini prid. Kal. Mart.
 Anno Sac. M.DCCC.VI.
 Et in suburbanis sepultus est
 Elizabeth Hume neptis ejus amantissima
 Hoc monumentum honorarium
 P. C.

CAROLO JACOBO FOX
 Baronis Holland de Foxley a maximo natu filio proximo
 Septies a suffragatoribus Westmonasteriens.
 In senatum lecto
 Regiæ Majestati Georgii Terti a conciliis secretis
 Et scribæ publicis rebus præposito
 Viro
 Non solum acumine ingenii et celeritate
 Mirifice prædito
 Sed ab optimis etiam
 Quæ ad solidam veramque gloriam valent
 Doctrinis cumulatissime instructo
 Scriptori
 Gravi et subtili
 Qui in momentis officiorum perpendendis
 Et in explicandis rationibus bene gerendæ reipublicæ
 Utili se id quod honestum esset
 Nunquam non præferre
 Aperte et palem profitebatur
 Oratori
 Vario et vehementi et volubili
 Qui exemplorum e communi vita
 Et historia depromptarum copia
 Sententiarum luminibus
 Ex intima philosophia haustarum
 Ponderibus verborum sequentium res penitus perspectas
 Vultu item gestu voce quæ significarent ingenue
 Quo sensu quidvis pronuaciasset
 Miram sibi audientiam faciebat
 Et summam auctoritatem atque fidem conciliabat
 Simplicis veritatis cultori
 Qui sermonis et morum suavitate
 Mentis suorum allicere malebat
 Quam arrogantia perfringere
 Frandis omnino et crudelitatis
 Acerrimo inimico
 Libertatis quæ decuit fortissimo vindici
 Strenuo qua licuit suasori pacis
 Civi amantissimo patriæ
 Et magis spectanti ad memoriam posteritatis
 Et consentientem bonorum laudem
 Quam fragilem et caducam præsentis temporis gratiam
 Homini ita consiliorum quæ considerate suscepisset tenaci
 Ut se potentem sui et sibi constantem

In maximis rerum asperitatibus præstaret
 Ita decore et moderate honoribus inserviendis parato
 Ut neque invideret cuiquam rivalium suorum
 Neque benevolentiam eorum qui dignitati ipsius faverent
 Blanditiis et assentationibus captaret
 Ita ad clementiam et mansuetudinem
 Vel a natura sic facto vel usu instituto
 Ut nihil humani a se alienum esse statueret
 Qui vixit ann. LVII. mens. VII. dieb. XXI.
 Decessit Id. Septembr. Anno Sacro M.DCCC.VI.
 Et cum frequentia non usitata
 Amicorum ex animo dolentium
 Conditus est in hac ecclesia
 VI. proxim. Id. Octobr.
 Rex Senatusque Britannicus
 H. M. P. P. P. jusserunt.

CAROLO JACOBO FOX
 Viro
 Simplici integro innocenti
 Oratori
 Qui de maximis rebus potuit
 Composite ornate graviter animoseque dicere
 Civi
 Politicæ disciplinæ quam a majoribus acceperat
 Peritissimo
 In tuenda libertate acerrimo
 Et conciliandæ pacis
 Inter reges ambitione discordes
 Nunquam non studioso
 Hanc columnam
 P. P. C.
 Gulielmus Chamberlayne
 Anno Sacro M.DCCC.X.

Viro optimo
 JACOBO MARTIN
 Cum ætate jam ingravescente
 A publicis negotiis
 Quibus in Senatu Britannico
 Per triginta annos diligentissime interfuerat
 Sua sponte secessisset
 Theokberienſes qui in suffragiis ferendis
 Honori ejus favere consueverant
 In testimonium grati animi
 Quo singularem ejus in patriam amorem
 Et exploratam erga se fidem prosequerantur
 Argenteum hoc poculum
 LL.D. DD.
 Anno Sacro M.DCCC.VII.

Extra parietem orientalem sepultus jacet
 MATTHEUS RAINE
 Scholæ Hartfordienſis annos L. amplius præceptor
 Ecclesiæ Sancti Joannis de Stanwick xxxviii. vicarius
 Parochiæ de Kirby Wiske rector xxii.
 Suscepta vitæ munera
 Cuncta diligenter admodum explevit
 Maritus probus liberalis pater

Strenuus magister
 Et in tradendis linguarum elementis peritissimus
 Magistratus integer
 Theologus haud ineptus
 Pastor fidelissimus
 Natus iv. Kal. Octobr. Anno Christi m.dcc.xxviii.
 Decessit vii. Id. Novembr. m.dccc.vi.
 Juxta conquiescit Esthera
 Quam ex honesta de Vasey in comitatu Cambriae
 Stirpe conjundam uxorem duxit
 v. Kal. Maii A. C. m.dcc.lvi.
 Mulierem prudentia plus quam muliebri instructam
 Pietate erga Deum parentes maritum liberos egregia
 Justa in superiores paresque observantia
 Singulari erga afflictos humanitate
 Moribus vere Christianis incorrupta fide
 Nata iv. Kal. Junii A. C. m.dcc.xxiii.
 Obiit vii. Kal. Julii m.dccc.iii.
 Havete parentes dilectissimi sint
 Animæ nostræ vobiscum
 E. M. et I. R. PP.

RICARDO PONSON, A.M.
 Bastonæ in agro Norfolkiciensi oriundo
 Et in Schola Etonensi
 Optimis disciplinis instituto
 Collegii hujusce quondam socio
 Et linguae Græcæ in Academia Cantabrigiensi
 Per xv. annos professori
 Qui decessit vii. Kal. Octobr.
 Anno Domini m.dccc.viii.
 Ætat. xlix.
 Et in hoc sacello conditus æst
 Magister sociique predicti collegii
 Una cum ejusdem alumnis
 Omnium generum atque æquilum
 H. M. pecunia collata
 P. CC.
 Inerant in hoc viro
 Multæ et reconditæ littære
 Egregia jam inde a pueritia indoles ingenii
 Summa in omnibus studiis ad quæ incubuit
 Dilligentia et singulare acumen
 Firma et prope incrediblis
 Rerum ac verborum memoria
 Facietiarum quidam lepos
 Non modo ad superbum judicium
 Intelligentium et doctorum
 Verum etiam ad popularem sensum
 Mirifice accommodatus
 In erigendo et identidem instaurando
 Quicquid vel situ vetustatis obrutum
 Vel deformatum incuria librariorum
 Diu in codicibus manu exaratis delituisse
 Acerrima et animi et oculorum acies
 In proprietatibus
 Tum pedestris tum poetici sermonis
 Exquisite cogitatione enodandis

Classical Extracts from

Et versibus
 Qui in dramaticis veterum operibus reperiuntur
 Ad certam rationis
 Atque usus normam dirigendis
 Teretes et religiosæ aures
 Tanta denique in Græcis et Latinis scriptoribus
 Corrigendis atque explicandis
 Subtilitas et elegantia
 Ut Bentleio in re critica primas tenente
 Porsonus jure ac merito videretur
 In secundis præclare consistere.

ROBERTO SMITH, A.M.
 Coll. Regal. apud Cantabrigienses
 Quondam socio
 Jurisconsulto de plurimis
 Et civibus Britannicis et Asiæ incolis
 B. M.
 Viro ob ingenii vim insitam
 Ob multam et exquisitam doctrinam
 Ob sententias in versibus Latine scriptis
 Uberes atque argutas
 Sine cincinnis fucoque puerili
 Ob genus orationis in agendis causis
 Non captiosum et veteratorium
 Sed forte virile vehemens
 Et qua res postulaverit
 Magnificum etiam ac splendidum
 Ob gravitatem sermonis familiaris
 Lepore et facetiis jucundissime conditam
 Ob fidem humanitatemque
 In vita instituenda
 Et in maximis negotiis procurandis
 Altitudinem animi singularem
 Cum fama multis liberaliter eruditis noto
 Tum suis omnibus carissimo
 Hunc librum
 D. D.

SAMUEL PARR
 Quarto Kal. Decemb. Anno Sacro M.DCCC.XI.

Cum ALEXANDER Russiæ Imperator
 Mens. Jun. Anno Sacro M.DCCC.XIV.
 Oxonium inviseret
 Se suamque sororem unice amatam
 In Collegio Mertonensi
 Voluit excipi hospitio
 Quod ne posteri nescirent
 Studiosæ atque honorifice iis commodatum
 Custos sociique ejusdem collegii
 Hanc tabellam marmoream
 Posuerunt.

GULIELMUS JESSE, A.M.
 Collegii sacrosanctæ Trinitatis apud Oxonienses
 Olim alumnus
 Comiti de Glasco a sacris
 Ribbesfordiæ in comitatu Vigorn.

Et Dowlesie in comitatu Salop. rector
 Hujus ecclesie in qua conditus est
 Vicarius perpetuus
 Et concionator pomeridianus
 Vixit annos LXXVI. mens. VIII. dies XVII.
 Vir erat
 Justus integer religiosus
 Qui
 Cum sibi conscius esset se Evangelio
 Sincere constanterque credere
 Et Deum habere in quo
 Omnem spem salutis eternæ defigeret
 Mente qua Christianum decebat tranquilla
 Vitam cum morte commutavit
 Tricesimo die Decembris Anno Sacro M.DCCC.XIV.
 Pastoris optime de se meriti
 Grate memeres
 Et sperantes fore
 Ut suus esset idem qui illius exitus
 Auditores ejus atque amici
 Hoc monimentum ponendum curaverunt.

GULIELMO ROFTOE
 Viro
 Multiplici et exquisita doctrina
 Integritate singulari
 Et summa non solum vitæ et naturæ
 Sed sermonis etiam comitate
 Prædito
 Hunc librum
 Quem a prænobili et pererudito
 Amico suo
 Georgio Henrico, Barone de Holland
 Paulo antea acceperat
 D. D.
 SAMUEL PARR
 ΦΙΛΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΤΝΟΙΑΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ
 Kal. Decemb. Anno Sacro M.DCCC.XV.

THOMÆ ARNOLD, M.D.
 Viro integerrimo sanctissimo
 Græcis atque Latinis litteris erudito
 Et optimis philosophiæ disciplinis instructo
 Qui
 Cum in hoc oppido per LII. annos medicinam
 Scienter ac perite factitasset
 Et præcipue ad curationem hominum
 Ex insania laborantium incubisset
 Decessit IV. Non. Septembr. Anno Domini M.DCCC.XVI.
 Ætat. LXXV.
 Et magnum sui desiderium
 Apud omnes bonos reliquit
 Maria conjux ejus superstes
 Hoc monimentum contra votum posuit.

CAROLO FOX TOWNSEND
 Honoratissimi viri Johannis Townshend filio

Classical Extracts from

Hujus collegii alumno
 A dolorescenti optimarum artium studiiis erudito
 Sodali ob suavitatem sermonis et morum amabili
 Qui vixit annos XXI. menses IX. dies V.
 Decessit IV. Non. April. Anno Sacro M.DCCC.XVII.
 Cantabrigienses sui
 H. M. LL. M. ponendum curaverunt.

H. S. E.
 GUILLIELMUS BENNET, S. T. P.
 Qui
 Londini natus
 Et in Schola Harroviensi
 Litteris humanioribus imbutus
 In hoc collegio
 Scholaris socii tutoris officiis
 Per annos XXVII.
 Cumulate satisfecit
 Postea cum a Johanne Comite de Westmoreland
 In Hibernia regis locum tenente
 Habitus esset unice dignus
 In eadem episcopalem
 Corcagiensem primo deinde Clonensem
 Evectus est
 Integritate et innocentia singulari præditus
 Recte idem et suaviter vitam egit
 Difficile ut esset judicare
 Utrum amici magis doctrinam
 Multiplicem illam et subilem venerarentur
 An morum felicitatem et comitatem diligerent
 Vixit ann. LXXIV. mens. III. dies XXIII.
 Decessit Anno Sacro
 M.DCCC.XX.

Hoc monumentum positum est
 Ex ultima voluntate
 GUILLIELMI BENNET, S. T. P.
 Qui
 Londini natus
 Et in Schola Harroviensi litteris humanioribus imbutus
 In hoc collegio
 Scholaris socii et tutoris officiis
 Per annos XXVII.
 Cumulate satisfecit
 Postea cum a Joanne Comite de Westmoreland
 In Hibernia regis locum tenente
 Habitus esset unice dignus
 Qui a sacris ei et ab epistolis secretis esset
 In eadem episcopalem
 Corcagiensem deinde Clonensem evectus est
 Integritate et innocentia singulari præditus
 Recte idem et suaviter vitam egit
 Ut difficile esset judicare
 Utrum amici magis doctrinam ejus
 Multiplicem et exquisitam venerarentur
 An morum comitatem animumque
 In rebus benevolam diligerent

Vixit ann. LXXIV. mens. III. dies XXIII.
Decessit XVII. Kal. Aug.
Anno Sacro M.DCCC.XX.
Et Plumstediæ in agro Cantiensi
Conditus est.

SAMUELI PARR
Ut suæ cum illo amicitia
Indicium aliquod extaret
Hanc Aristophanis editionem principem
Testamento legavit
SAMUEL ROMILLY
Fuit hic vir
Altitudine quadam animi præditus
Et ad amabilem illam gravitatis
Cum facilitate conjunctionem
Vita et moribus comprobendam
Unice idoneus
A philosophia historia et usu
Ad causas tum forenses tum senatorias
Cumulate instructus
In dicendi genere non veteratorio aut declamatorio
Sed forti et virili excellens præclare
Omni ab invidia et arrogantia
Vacuus atque integer
A severitate in reos abhorrens
Mitis et misericors in calamitosos
Prudens ad consilia
Propositi tenax
Idemque ob singularem
In parentes conjugem atque liberos pietatem
Et insignem ad maximam laudem
Patriæ amorem
Bonis omnibus merito carissimus.

HENRICO BROUGHAM
Causæ suæ contra veteratores
Acerbe et aspere accusantes
Patrono
Gravi et vehementi et disertio et fideli
Hunc librum
Grati animi MNHMOXTNON dedit
Carolina
Georgii Quarti Regis Britanniarum
Conjux
A iudicibus erga se ream iniquis
Contumeliose in jus vocata
Ab officiis multorum
Quos flatu prospero fortunæ usa
Bene merendo sibi devinctos esse
Crediderat
Inopinato deserta
A consiliariis purpuratis
Domino servientibus
Fœdissime prodita
Sed a scelere omnino pura
11. Decembr. M.DCCC.XXIII.

Classical Extracts from

MRS. SARAH ANNE WYNNE,
The ingenious and beloved daughter
Of SAMUEL and JANE PARR,
Was born at Stanmore in Middlesex,
Dec. 31st, 1772,
Died at Hatton, July 8th, 1810,
And was interred on the 18th in this chancel,
Between the remains of her sister
Catharine Jane Parr
And her third daughter Madalina Wynne,
Who departed this life, May 26th, 1810,
Aged two years, eight months, and nine days.

ON DR. JOHNSON'S MONUMENT, IN ST. PAUL'S.

To E. Malone, Esq.

Ἐπὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ μῦθον ὑστέρηθ' ὁ θεὸς. These, dear Sir, are the words of a writer of whom, as compared with your Deus in dramatic writing, William Shakspeare, I have often said, what Quintilian with equal wisdom and felicity says of Virgil compared with Homer, that he is second indeed, but ita secundus, ut primo sit propior, quam tertio. If Dr. Joe Warton were at your elbow, he would be complaining that Æschylus has confounded a little the mythological and the physical properties of contention, and I should produce twenty instances from the best classical writers who have done the same. But, criticism apart, I mean to say that, as we dispute to little purpose, it is high time for me receptui canere. I wish, indeed, on this and every other occasion, to retreat like Ajax, *ἐντροπαλιόμενος*. But, after the concessions I have made to your wishes, I think that you will allow me in discussing matters with such men as yourself and Sir W. Scott not to be *μάχης ἀκόρητος*. My judgment in favor of *probabilis* is unmoved, and, I believe, immovable. But, as I cannot persuade you and some other valuable men to think with me, I have altered the passage finally; and, so far as good Latin or just description may be concerned, I have altered it satisfactorily to myself. Here it stands,—

Poëtæ luminibus sententiarum
et ponderibus verborum admirabili.

This I hope is honeyed enough for your taste, and solid enough for your appetite. Sir W. Scott was scared at the possible objections of Reverend and Right Reverend hypercritics. Well, as I am in a yielding humor, I will pay some attention to the squeamishness of weak brethren. As they may think, or fear lest others should think, that there is some lurking taint of Heathenism in *αὐτῶν ἐκ μακρῶν*, and as they may not suppose the expression sufficiently purified by Johnson's crucible, I altered the first part by substituting *ἐν μακρότεροι πόνοι*. And now, dear Sir, they must allow that *μακρότεροι* is a very sound orthodox word for the blessed in heaven, among whom Johnson is represented as wishing for the merited reward of his labors.

Since you have obligingly taken so much trouble about the contents of the inscription, I must beg the favor of you to take a great deal more in having it well executed as to the form and position of the words, letters, stops, &c. For my part I have but little confidence either in the statuary, or the auxiliaries of statuary, where Greek and Latin are concerned. But, I am myself a very fastidious and a very anxious

man on these matters, and I feel my credit interested in having a Latin epitaph engraved according to due classical form. Besides, we have known a Greek line, and Greek words, were sometimes formidable, even to Greek engravers. Monsieur Le Roy has made a pleasant mistake by following Wheler and Spon, who followed the engraver, who did *not* follow the writer. In a Greek inscription found in a temple at Athens, Le Roy prints 'Αθήναι ἀρχηγέται, and, like a true Frenchman under the old government, he supposes the words to mean the Athenian *noblesse*, who had dedicated the inscription to Augustus. Alas, the Athenians were pure democrats when this inscription was made, and the Frenchman's blunder arose from the original mistake of the engraver, who, in the penultimate letter, put an alpha for a delta. If my unrelenting detestation of the present war, in its principles, conduct, &c., should ever bring me to the Old Bailey to be tried for high-treason, I beg of you not to produce this letter as a proof of my aversion to aristocracy; for, before such a judge as Baron Eyre, I should plead in vain that I told the tale as a warning, and that this warning was given out of my zeal for having all things done well for the memory of Dr. Johnson, who, if living, would have been the prince of aristocrats. To speak seriously,—engravers must be watched. Scriptori recte vivendi gravissimo, I have altered into,—Magistro virtutis gravissimo, for the purpose, as I told you, of shortening and lightening the inscription. In all these things I give way ἐκὼν ἀκούει γὰρ θυμῷ. And must I blush for having done what even the νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς is represented as doing in old Homer? You will expunge probabili poetæ, and præceptorī recte vivendi gravissimo, and bid the engraver follow the paper which you will receive on the same day this comes to you. I have enclosed it to our friend Mr. Courtenay. I am, dear Sir, your very respectful, obedient servant,

S. PARR.

To Dr. Parr.

My dear Sir,

June 2, 1796.

I am still, as I at first was, an advocate for *probabilis*, nor do I much fancy the *luminibus et ponderibus*. The Literary Club may decide as they choose; but Ernesti explains the word, *qui placet, probatur*, which might satisfy even daintier ears. I told you that a commentary would be necessary.

But you have never favored me with a copy of the whole. Pray let me have it ὅπως τάχιστα.

At Sir William Scott I am surprised. As to dilettanti scholars, they seldom have my wonder. I met Seward a few days ago, and gave my most decided opinion in favor of *probabilis*, which had staggered him.

The purpose of writing, to be sure, is to be understood; but a Latin inscription in St. Paul's is not meant to be addressed to every-day readers. I stick to *probabilis*; but pray let me see the whole.

As you have a Placcius in view, whenever a book in return for Priscian strikes you, let me hear, and I will thankfully make good my moiety of the exchange. Adieu, my dear Sir,

Ever affectionately and truly yours, C. BURNEY.

P.S. I write in great haste.

[Vol. 4, p. 702.]

SELECTIONS

From PSYCHÆ, or Songs on Butterflies, &c. By
T. H. BAYLY, ESQ. Translated into Latin, by the
REV. ARCHDEACON WRANGHAM.

I.

I'm a volatile thing, with an exquisite wing,
 Sprinkled o'er with the tints of the rainbow;
 All the Butterflies swarm to behold my sweet form,
 Though the Grubs may all vote me a vain beau.
 I my toilet go through, with my rose-water dew,
 And each blossom contributes its essence;
 Then all fragrance and grace, not a plume out of place,
 I adorn the gay world with my presence—
 In short, you must know,
 I'm the Butterfly Beau.

At first I enchant a fair Sensitive plant,
 Then I flirt with the Pink of perfection:
 Then I seek a sweet Pea, and I whisper; "For thee
 I have long felt a fond predilection."
 A Lily I kiss, and exult in my bliss,
 But I very soon search for a new lip;
 And I pause in my flight to exclaim with delight,
 "Oh! how dearly I love you, my Tulip!"
 In short, you must know,
 I'm the Butterfly Beau.

Thus for ever I rove, and the honey of love
 From each delicate blossom I pilfer;
 But though many I see pale and pining for me,
 I know none that are worth growing ill for:
 And though I must own, there are some that I've known,
 Whose external attractions are splendid;
 On myself I must dote, for in my pretty coat
 All the tints of the garden are blended—
 In short, you must know,
 I'm the Butterfly Beau.

1.

Res sum levicula, nitidissima ala,
 Iridisque refulgeo luce:
 Visum me properant quotquot Psychæ volant,
 Rideant licet omnes Erucae.
 Me rite como, rosæ rore lavo,
 Flos et quisque mi præbet odores;

Selections from Wrangham's Translations. 247

Elegans, agilis, curatisque comis
Tum mirandus intermeo flores—
Scitote enim me
Bellulissimum esse.

Mimosam in primis levibus peto alis,
Mox Caryophylla saluto:
Dein Pisa quæro, dicens; "Vos deamo,
Ceterisque præcellere puto."
Liliumque osculor, basioque fruor,
Donec nova spectaro labella;
Illinc tunc avolo, lætus et clamito,
"Tu, Tulipa, mi sola pulchella"—
Scitote enim me
Bellulissimum esse.

Sic erro levis, et cujusque floris
Spolia ampla sic refero mella:
Clamat nemo de me "Io triumphæ,"
Licet ambiat plurima bella.
Nonnullas, fateor, ego ad tempus sequor,
Nitor exterus quas decoravit;
Memetipsum at amem, cujus omne vestem
Quod in hortulo splendet ornavit—
Scitote enim me
Bellulissimum esse.

II.

My own Blue Bell! my pretty Blue Bell!
I never will rove where Roses dwell:
My wings you view of your own bright hue,
And oh! never doubt that my heart's true blue!
Though oft I own, I have foolishly flown
To peep at each bud that was newly blown;
I now have done with folly and fun,
For there's nothing like constancy under the sun.
My own Blue Bell! my pretty Blue Bell!
I never will rove where Roses dwell:
My wings you view of your own bright hue,
And oh! never doubt that my heart's true blue!

Some *Belles* are *Blues*, invoking the muse,
And talking of vast intellectual views;
Their crow-quill's tip in the ink they dip,
And they prate with the lore of a learned lip:
Blue bells like these may be wise as they please,
But I love my own Blue Bell that bends in the breeze:
Pride passes her by—but she charms my eye
With a tint, that resembles the cloudless sky.
My own Blue Bell! my pretty Blue Bell!
I never will rove where Roses dwell:
My wings you view of your own bright hue,
And oh! never doubt that my heart's true blue!

2.

O Campanula! mea Campanula!
 Mi in posterum nulla visetur Rosa:
 En! tui similes gero pennas ales,
 Cordique fixo stat colore fides!
 Seduxit sæpe nova gemmula me—
 Fasso mihi, Campanula, ah! ignosce.
 Valetote, joci; tuque, Moria, abi;
 Melius nil enim fide visum est soli.
 O Campanula! mea Campanula!
 Mi in posterum nulla visetur Rosa:
 En! tui similes gero pennas ales,
 Cordique fixo stat colore fides!

Sunt *campanæ*¹ quædam *cærulæ*,
 Quæ de mente crepant litteratissime:
 Atramento plumam mersant summani,
 Garriuntque quod venerit in buccam.
 Sapiant istæ per plurime!
 Capit aura quassata Campanula me:
 Præterit fastus; at mi oculus
 Recreatur his sudi coloribus.
 O Campanula! mea Campanula!
 Mi in posterum nulla visetur Rosa:
 En! tui similes gero pennas ales,
 Cordique fixo stat colore fides!

III.

Each bower has beauty for me,
 There's a charm in each blossom that blows;
 And, if absent the Lily should be,
 I shall do very well with the Rose:
 If Roses are not in the way,
 I'll fly to a Hyacinth soon;
 And I never will quarrel with May,
 For wanting the Roses of June.
 No! no! 'tis my pleasure to chase
 Each pretty bud under the sun:
 Why should I insult the whole race,
 By a silly selection of one?

I love each exotic, that deigns
 In a climate like this to expand;
 And my heart its affection retains
 For the bloom of my dear native land:

¹ Quidni et hoc verbo ejusmodi feminas denotemus, utpote quæ sonitum tantum plerumque edant? Noane in mentem nobis aliquando venit pro voce Gallica *belles*, deleta littera *e*, substituere *bells*? Inde porro, tmesi quadam artificiosa, quod miretur lector, *campan-ulæ*; eodem prorsus modo, quo *Blue-Belles*! (MART. SCRIBL.)

In summer's gay mansions I dwell ;
 And since summer so soon will be past,
 Though I love her first bud very well,
 I have love in reserve for her last.
 Yes ! yes ! 'tis my pleasure to chase
 Each pretty bud under the sun :
 Why should I offend the whole race
 By a silly selection of one ?

3.

Hortus mihi quisque placet,
 Est flosculus quisque suavis ;
 Et Lilio absente, lubet
 Memet recreare Rosis :
 Extemplo Hyacinthum sequor,
 Vaganti si Rosa desit ;
 Nec Maio de mense queror,
 Quod Juniam haud genuit.
 Ah ! non ; mihi est volupe
 Omnem ligurire florem :
 Unum seligens stolide,
 Totum genus cur irritum ?
 Flos quisque mi ridet, oris .
 Qui hospes in his vigeat ;
 Nec floribus in patriis
 Est, qui mihi non rideat :
 Domum mihi grata præbet
 Ætas—celeris sed abit !—
 Et gemmula prima placet,
 Nec ultima non placuit.
 Sic est—mihi est volupe
 Omnem ligurire florem :
 Unum seligens stolide,
 Totum genus cur cruciem ?

IV.

Oh no : we never mention her !
 Her name is never heard :
 My lips are now forbid to speak
 That once-familiar word.
 From sport to sport they hurry me,
 To banish my regret ;
 And, when they win a smile from me,
 They think that I forget.
 They bid me seek in change of scene
 The charms, that others see :
 But, were I in a foreign land,
 They'd find no change in me.
 'Tis true, that I behold no more
 The valley where we met ;
 The hawthorn-tree no more I see—
 But how can I forget ?

They tell me, she is happy now,
 The gayest of the gay;
 They say, that she forgets me—but
 I heed not what they say.
 Like me, perhaps, she struggles with
 Each feeling of regret:
 But, if she once has loved like me,
 She never can forget.

4.

Ah! ejus nunquam mentio fit,
 De illa siletur:
 Nomen—tam notum olim—fari
 Haud mi conceditur.
 Ad varios me lusus trahunt,
 Ne defleam sortem;
 Et sicubi subrisero,
 Credunt immemorem.

Loco mutato ut gaudeam,
 Par ceteris, monent:
 At, ut peregre absim, me
 Mutatum nil cernent.
 Convallem, qua convenimus,
 Frustra quidem quæro,
 Fagumque:—at obliviscier
 Ah! quo queam modo?
 Illam felicem prædicant,
 Immo alacerrimam;
 Nostrumque—at haud putavero—
 Affirmant oblitam.
 Premit dolorem forsitan,
 Ut nos; amaverit
 At ut nos, obliviscier
 Ah! nunquam poterit.

The ANCIENT FRAGMENTS; containing what remains of the Writings of Sanchoniatho, Berosus, Abydenus, Megasthenes, and Manetho; also the Hermetic Creed, &c. Translated by J. P. CORY, Esq. Fellow of Caius Coll. Cambridge. London, W. Pickering, 1828.

WE remember an occasion, on which the authority of Moses was questioned by a village lawyer, who never failed, when opportunities were offered, to advocate infidelity or atheism.

At length the gravity of a parish priest was disturbed by such contempt of religion ; but being more disposed to rely on the opinions of others than to urge his own, he roughly demanded an authority for atheism, as ancient and respectable as Moses. The challenge was no sooner given than accepted, as the omen of a signal triumph. "Yes," retorted the civilian, "Sancho-niatho is as ancient ; and he assures us, from undoubted records, that the world was the effect of wind acting on matter. Now what Sanchoniatho says must be true ; for his name implies that he was '*a lover of truth.*'"¹ But "who is Sanchoniatho ?" was the general inquiry ; when, much to our surprise, we learned that this redoubted name might signify "*a rock prepared for an ass.*"² "Hence," continued the divine, "if Sanchoniatho is the rock, on which atheism is founded, the drowsy animal, for whom it was prepared, represents the atheist ; and long may he enjoy an authority, which obtains him such a flattering distinction."

Now, when a name is subject to such conflicting etymologies, we may expect some difference of opinion on the fragments of an ancient author, who describes the origin of the world and the primitive condition of man. Accordingly, several eminent writers, being influenced by prejudice, have rejected Sanchoniatho as a fictitious character, and his pretended fragments as an artful forgery. Others also, who were biassed by particular studies, have determined to see nothing in this Phœnician history but a corruption of the works of Moses. When, therefore, we opened Mr. Cory's publication, we expected to find a disquisition on the evidence alleged by each party, or at least some notice of a learned and not uninteresting controversy. In this expectation, however, we have been greatly disappointed. For though Mr. Cory professes some slight examination of his author, his illustrations are confined exclusively to the works of Cumberland ; for whose theories, however wild and extravagant, he is not responsible. Or when more ample information is required, we are referred to the "inimitable works of Mr. Faber and Bryant," as conclusive authority in matters of remote antiquity. Now though we respect the memory of Mr. Bryant, as a learned and ingenious author, his theories are far from satisfactory, being generally founded on loose and extravagant etymologies. And as to Mr. Faber, the other idol of Mr. Cory's den, particular studies have acquired such influence over his

¹ Euseb. Præp. Evang. l. i. c. 9. p. 31. Bochart, Geog. Sacr. p. 771.

² Ursinus de Zoroastre, &c. p. 185.

opinions, that every subject, which attracts his notice, imbibes the color of his ruling prejudice. Hence instead of theory resulting from a patient investigation of facts, these latter are distorted with singular temerity to suit a preconceived hypothesis. In short, Mr. Faber's flights through the chaos of mythology are so bold and unsubdued by judgment, that he sinks beneath the pressure of its contending elements; and consequently, he is not a guide, whose footsteps can be followed in the dark recesses of antiquity. And as Mr. Cory's authorities are few, so his own remarks are barren and unsatisfactory. When, for instance, he informs us, that Sanchoniatho was the most ancient author of the heathen world, he neglects to add in what age he flourished. Now Mr. Cory must know, that if the antiquity of an author depends on the æra, at which he lived, the former must remain doubtful as long as the latter is unsettled. Hence, instead of indeterminate assertions without proof, it would have been better to prefix a short notice of the probable age, at which Sanchoniatho lived. For if the intrinsic value of his work consists in its remote antiquity, it is a matter of considerable importance, whether the author was contemporary with Gideon, or flourished at the later epochs of David and Nabonassar. But when chronological objections have been raised, affecting the genuineness of his history, such inquiries become indispensable in an editor. It was, therefore, with some surprise, that we found no notice taken of objections, as if the authenticity of Sanchoniatho's fragments was beyond suspicion.

Nor are we disposed to accord with Mr. Cory, in the propriety of publishing a Greek work, in any other than a Greek form. It may be irksome to an editor to accentuate a Greek author, and more difficult than irksome to amend the corruptions, which time or ignorant transcribers have made in a manuscript. But we maintain, without fear of contradiction, that an editor should attempt both; for otherwise, he either publishes an imperfect work, or leaves his author unintelligible. Mr. Cory, however, having advocated a method, to which we object, shall speak for himself, that our readers may judge, how far he is justified, in neglecting the most essential parts of an editor's duty.

"But in no case have I presumed to alter without authority; and where neither the margin nor Eusebius afforded that, I have permitted the error to stand as I found it. The alteration of a single letter would sometimes correct a gross grammatical mistake; yet at the same time, by retaining the letters as they stand, and making a different division of them into words, a different meaning may be elicited. This work

being a mere collection of quotations, I have not deviated from the usual method of quoting without the points. In most cases we make no use of them; in some instances, their introduction might stamp one particular signification on certain passages, in which two, widely different, present themselves; but where so much uncertainty prevails, every person must be at liberty to accent as he pleases, or to divide the words as best may suit his purpose. To introduce the accents generally, and to omit them in those sentences, which have a double import, and in which they might assist us to determine the meaning; in short, to use them, where they are of no use, and to omit them, where they might be turned to some account, would be an eccentricity more needing an apology, than the course I have ventured to pursue."

Now we were not aware that it was usual in works of learning to leave errors, without attempting a cure. For the illustrious examples which Mr. Cory's university has afforded—the names of Bentley and of Porson—were sufficient, we conceive, to recommend the contrary practice, as more becoming the united character of an editor and scholar. The reason assigned for departing from it in the present instance is one, which, being applicable to all classical publications, proves the impropriety of allowing an exception. The duty of an editor consists in correcting grammatical mistakes, whether depending on the alteration of a single letter, or resulting from the syntactical disagreement of the different parts of a sentence. Now we know, as well as Mr. Cory, that a different meaning is the consequence of such corrections; and well it is so, for without them the sentence, being ungrammatical, has scarcely any meaning at all. Hence, if the real meaning of an author can only be obtained by knowing the construction of his sentences, it was the duty of Mr. Cory to adjust them with such accuracy and precision, that his meaning might be clearly understood: nor is it customary, as Mr. Cory conceives, to omit the accents in quotations, and much less in works forming a collection of fragments. Mr. Bryant, our countryman, is a late example: but for this, among other inaccuracies, he has been severely censured by foreign critics. The argument also, by which Mr. Cory attempts to justify the omission, if generally admitted, would encourage a faulty pronunciation. No language can be read or pronounced without accents: hence the authors who disapprove of the accents preserved by the Greek grammarians, are compelled to employ others, derived either from their own or the Latin language. If, therefore, accents of some sort or other must be used, we see no justifiable reason for omitting them when peculiar to a language, and leaving others to be substituted, *per accidens*, at variance with its genius and character.

Having made some general observations on the method
VOL. XXXIX. Cl. Jl. NO. LXXVIII. S

which Mr. Cory has adopted, it remains that we should notice the matter selected for publication. The first, then, is the fragment of a Phœnician history, long buried in the ruins of Oriental literature. It professes to account for the origin of the world and the production of mankind, whose history is afterwards continued in a manner brief, but pregnant with curious matter. It was written by Sanchoniatho, a priest of Berytus, in the reign of Semiramis queen of Babylon, and is said to have been translated and published, in the time of Adrian,¹ by Philo Byblius, a Phœnician Greek. But as several objections have been made to its authenticity, it will be necessary, before we examine their force, to translate some prefatory observations of Eusebius, which Mr. Cory has strangely omitted.

"Now the errors of Phœnician polytheism are related by Sanchoniatho,² a writer of remote antiquity, and older, as some say, than the Trojan war. Sanchoniatho, moreover, according to their testimony, was commended for the accuracy and truth of his Phœnician history, which Philo Byblius published in the form of a Greek translation. These facts are mentioned by Porphyry, a writer of the present age, in a virulent treatise against the Christians. In this treatise he bears testimony to Sanchoniatho, as follows:—'Sanchoniatho, of Berytus, having received some records from Hieromabaal,³ a priest of the god Jevo,⁴ composed a very faithful history of the Jews, which agrees exactly with their names of persons and places. His work, being dedicated to Abibaal the king of Berytus, was commended by the king and such persons of his time as were curious in the search of truth. The era of Abibaal, as it is proved by the succession of the Phœnician kings, is antecedent to the

¹ Suidas, voce Φίλων Βύβλιος.

² Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. i. c. 9. p. 30 D.

³ Bochart considers that Hieromabaal, Jerubbaal, and Jerubbeseth, are different names for the same person. Hence he concludes, that Hieromabaal was Gideon, who was named Jerubbaal. The objection, that Hieromabaal was a priest of the god Jevo, while Gideon was not even a Levite, is anticipated by supposing, that a Gentile ignorant of Jewish affairs might easily be mistaken; for the ephod, which Gideon raised from the spoils of the enemy in his own city, was afterwards converted into an object of idolatrous worship. Besides, the word כהנים has the different significations of *priests* and *nobles*: in which case Sanchoniatho might easily err in making Gideon or Hieromabaal a priest. But the chronological contradictions are so irreconcilable, that Bochart's opinion must be rejected altogether.—Vide Boch. Geogr. Sacr. p. 774. Van Dale Diss. de Sanch. p. 479.

⁴ Boch. Geogr. Sacr. p. 774 sq.

Trojan war, and almost approaches to the time of Moses.¹ Now Sanchoniatho (a name in the Phœnician language signifying a lover of truth) compiled his history from writings in

¹ To prove the antiquity of Sanchoniatho, Porphyry mentions two contemporary princes, Abibaal and Semiramis. The former he represents as living before the Trojan war; the latter before, or at least at the time of the Trojan war; but he supposes both to have approached very near to the time of Moses. Hence Porphyry has committed a gross error in chronology; for the first Semiramis, who preceded the Trojan war, flourished 1817 years before the Christian era. Now Moses was born B. C. 1611; and consequently, Semiramis preceded Moses 206 years. The second Semiramis, according to Herodotus, preceded Nitocris by five generations; and consequently was the wife of Nabonassar. Now, according to the famous era of Nabonassar, she would flourish B. C. 746. Hence she was posterior to Moses by 865 years. With regard to Abibaal, the king of Berytus, no mention of such a king occurs in history. Josephus mentions an Abibaal, king of Tyre, and the father of Hiram, who was contemporary with Solomon. Hence Abibaal would be coeval with David. In this case he preceded Semiramis, the wife of Nabonassar, 309 years, David having been chosen king of Israel, B. C. 1055; consequently these epochs disagree. The Phœnician annals of Dins and Menander being lost, we must recur to conjecture. It is positively asserted by Porphyry, that Abibaal, the king of Berytus, and Semiramis, were contemporaries. For this information he was probably indebted to Sanchoniatho's history. But it may be asked, how came Sanchoniatho to notice Semiramis the queen of Babylon, who had no connexion with the Phœnicians? The answer is satisfactory. A revolution, which destroyed the Assyrian empire at Nineveh and shook Asia to its centre, had just occurred. To its occurrence Semiramis, with her husband Nabonassar, were indebted for the kingdom established at Babylon. Now Pul, or Sardanapalus, whose empire at Nineveh was destroyed by the Medes and Babylonians, had pushed his arms to the borders of Phœnicia, in the reign of Menahem, king of Israel. Hence such changes in Assyria might affect the future prosperity of Phœnicia; and consequently would be noticed by a contemporary historian, in a history which treated of the Jewish affairs. Such notices are very common. We may therefore suppose, in the absence of the Phœnician annals, that a king named Abibaal was contemporary with Semiramis, the wife of Nabonassar, and all the objections against this disputed history disappear.

The only difficulty remaining, is the association of these two reigns with the Trojan war, and their pretended approximation to the time of Moses. The siege of Troy being the era when civilisation began to dawn in Greece, it became an epoch, which served poets and historians as a *memoria technica* for other memorable events. Now, knowing as we do the artful character of Porphyry, we are disposed to consider these assertions a gratuitous assumption to depreciate the writings of Moses. Such assumptions are very common in controversial writers; and few were more likely to succeed with the ignorant than the present.

temples, and records in the several cities, which he visited. He flourished during the reign of Semiramis, queen of Assyria, who is stated to have lived before the Trojan war, or at least about this time. The works of Sanchoniathos were translated by Philo of Byblus into the Greek language.' Eusebius afterwards subjoins some observations, which are taken from Philo's preface to the first book of his translation. "Hence Philo, having divided the whole work of Sanchoniathos into nine books, prefaces the first with the following remarks, *verbatim* :—'While things were in this state, Sanchoniathos, a man of great knowledge and research, being desirous of learning the history of the world from its origin, examined the writings of Taautus with the greatest diligence; for he knew, that of all mankind Taautus was the first, who invented letters, and began the writing of commentaries. Taautus, on whose commentaries he laid the foundation of his history, was called by the Egyptians Thoyth, by the Alexandrians Thoth, and by the Greeks Hermes.' Having made these observations, Philo reproves the writers, who succeeded, for their disregard of truth, in reducing the fables of the gods to allegories and physical disquisitions. And then he proceeds :—'But the latest theological writers have rejected the events, which occurred at the beginning of things. By inventing allegory and fable, and by pretending an intimate connexion with the phenomena of nature, they instituted mysteries, which they involved in such deep obscurity, that one can scarcely distinguish what has really happened. But Sanchoniathos having met with some secret writings of the Ammonians, which he found deposited in their temples, and consequently were not known to every one, he employed himself in learning their contents.'"

Hence three objections have been raised: 1st. The lateness of publication¹ by Philo Byblius, combined with the silence of ancient authors on the existence of such a work as Sanchoniathos's, affords a strong presumption of forgery. 2ndly. A history² professing to be written in the reign of Semiramis, the wife of Ninus, but which mentions the foundation of Tyre, an event at least 227 years later, cannot be genuine. 3rdly. Taautus,³ Thoth, or Hermes, is described by Sanchonia-

¹ Dodwell's Works, 1723, p. 84 sqq.

² Scalig. in not. ad frag. Græc. libro De Emend. Temp. p. 40. Bochart. Geogr. Sacr. p. 776. Stillingf. Origines Sacræ, c. 2. We have shaped the objection to meet each case.

³ Meiners, Hist. Doctr. de vero Deo, tom. i. p. 66.

tho as a Phœnician, though undoubtedly an Egyptian deity. If, when we have examined these objections, no positive conclusions can be drawn in a case of such extreme difficulty, we must rest contented with our ignorance, till time has increased our knowledge of Phœnician literature and learning.

Now supposing, that a forgery was committed, the author would be actuated by some motive;¹ and consequently, as Philo is the only person to whom suspicion attaches, it is necessary to ascertain, by what motive he could be actuated in so difficult an undertaking. The motives usually assigned are, a desire of depreciating the writings of Moses, or of preventing the progress of Christianity, by overturning idolatry,² and establishing the ancient religion in its stead.

In the reign of Adrian, when Philo lived,³ the Jews were engaged in no controversy affecting the antiquity or credit of the works of Moses. Since the destruction of Jerusalem and their subsequent dispersion, they had ceased to attract the notice of their conquerors, who viewed them rather as a monument of divine vengeance, than as an object of fear or pity. If their religious tenets were opposed to idolatry, they were neither zealous nor forward in making proselytes. Hence it is improbable, that the works of Moses should excite apprehension, as tending to subvert prevailing institutions: for being addressed to the Jews as a peculiar people, they distinguished them from others, by imposing such painful obligations, that few heathens would accept them as the condition of obedience. But supposing that Philo was actuated by this motive, how could it escape the controversial writers in the church, who were as deeply interested in the credit of Moses as the Jews themselves? The taunts of Apion and the calumnies of Celsus were scarcely published, before they were refuted by Josephus and Origen. Accordingly we must conclude, either that Philo was not actuated by this motive, or that the work, at the time of its publication, had not the tendency ascribed to it by modern writers.

On the other hand, we are ready to admit, that Christianity, in the time of Adrian, had made considerable progress; but being confined to the lower orders of the people, this progress had not sufficiently attracted the rich and powerful, that Philo should undertake a work of such prodigious difficulty, as the forgery of a Phœnician history. Historians, it is true, in col-

¹ Goguet *De l'Origine des Loix*, &c. tom. i. p. 393.

² *Histoire de la Rep. des Lettres*, tom. v. p. 57 sq.

³ Suidas, voce *Φίλων Βύβλιος*.

lecting their materials, had noticed the origin of Christianity; but they dismissed the religion itself as a pestilent superstition, more fit for the scourge of a civil magistrate, than the grave inquiries of a philosopher: hence few persons of rank or distinction in the literary world had embraced it, their prejudices having generally led them to confound it with Judaism. But supposing, that apprehensions were excited, was the indirect method pursued by Philo best calculated to promote his object, or one which would occur to a man of common prudence and sagacity? If, for instance, he was conscious, that the fables, with which the Greeks had loaded their religion, were favorable to the cause of Christianity, he would carefully abstain from advocating others, of as gross a nature as any in their mythological catalogue: for his fraud would not be likely to succeed through the side of idolatry, unless his new system of theology was purified of the gross superstitions, which disgraced the old. But what is the fact? The Phœnician theology, advocated by Philo, is as full of fable as any legend in Greece or Egypt. What, for instance, can exceed the production of intelligent beings¹—their starting into life at the sound of thunder²—the *Bœtylia*, or animated stones³—the star found by Astarte, and consecrated at Tyre⁴—the mutilation of Uranus by Saturn,⁵ and the multitude of fables found in Sanchoniatho's history of the primitive ages? The Christian could observe nothing in such absurd relations calculated to impede the progress of his religion: hence he would leave the atheist and idolater to decide their own quarrels, like the cautious prince, who permits his adversaries to waste their strength in contending for some adjacent province, that he may obtain an easy prize at their expense.

But though neither of these motives can be attributed to Philo, he had an object, no doubt, in translating Sanchoniatho's theology. Now this object is clearly expressed in the preface of his work, for which we are indebted to Eusebius. If, therefore, Sanchoniatho's history confirms the object avowed by its translator, we are bound to believe his assertion, that he undertook its publication to remove the allegory, with which the Greeks had veiled the primitive history of the world.

But this motive will become more evident, if we consider the schism which existed in the heathen world.⁶ The absurdity of

¹ Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. i. p. 33 C.

² Id. id. p. 34 A.

³ Id. id. p. 37 D.

⁴ Id. id. p. 38 C.

⁵ Id. id. p. 38 D.

⁶ Diod. Sic. lib. vi. p. 3. Bipont. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ii. p. 59 C.

prevailing superstitions being generally admitted,¹ philosophers were divided in opinion. Some explained the gods of their country by allegory, in which they represented the active and passive causes in nature under the emblem of different divinities.² These allegorical explanations were employed in the mysteries,³ and afterwards by the Platonic philosophers, when pressed by the objections of the early Fathers. Others⁴ more candidly avowed, that their national deities were originally men, who had obtained divine honours for the services they had rendered mankind. Evhemerus,⁵ a Messenian philosopher, supported this system in a history of the gods, compiled with infinite labour from records and monuments in their different temples. Now the motive of Philo being clearly expressed, we may conclude, from his aversion to allegory, that he advocated the theological system of Evhemerus;⁶ and consequently, that he published the theology of Sanchoniatho to confirm the truth of that philosopher's speculations. Now if this was the case, which is highly probable, no motive for forgery existed. We ought, therefore, to be satisfied with the genuineness of this ancient history, especially considering, that Porphyry is not the only author, by whom it is mentioned; for Sanchoniatho had been previously noticed by Clement of Alexandria,⁷ as an historian, who had written the history of Phœnicia in his native language. We admit, that the passage quoted by Cyril does not occur at present in the works of Clement: but as a large portion of the first book of the *Stromata*, and many passages of the surviving eight, are lost, we should not be surprised at the omission. Athenæus,⁸ also, a writer of prodigious learning, had mentioned Sanchoniatho many years before the time of Porphyry. Hence, as Philo had no motive for the forgery, the silence of the Greek historians may be explained by their ignorance and aversion to Oriental literature. Berosus, for instance, is unnoticed by Diodorus, though Alexander's conquests had introduced his history into Greece. Other names as illustrious would have perished in the night of time, but for the care of ecclesiastical writers,

¹ Plat. de Rep. lib. ii. p. 99. Bekker. Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. i. c. 1.

² Bannier, Mythol. Expliq. tom. i. p. 9. 4to. Goguet de l'Orig. des Loix, &c. tom. i. p. 395. Orig. des tous les Cultes, tom. i. p. 380.

³ Varro, lib. iv. c. 10.

⁴ Sanch. ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 35 D sq.

⁵ Evhem. ap. Diod. Sic. lib. vi. ad princ. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. ii. p. 59.

⁶ Goguet de l'Orig. des Loix, &c. tom. i. p. 396.

⁷ Cyrill. adv. Julian. lib. vi. p. 205. Leips.

⁸ Athen. Deipnos. lib. iii. c. 37.

who, observing the coincidence of sacred and profane history, have preserved several precious monuments of antiquity neglected by the Greek historians. Hence, if Berosus, the historian of a nation, which had aimed at universal empire, was unnoticed by succeeding writers, it is not surprising, that Sanchoniatho, the annalist of a petty state, should be neglected as a philosopher.

Nor is the chronological ignorance of Porphyry so conclusive an objection against the genuineness of this ancient history, as Dodwell, and the learned men who have adopted his opinions, imagine: for it is not generally understood, that there were two queens of the name of Semiramis. The first was the wife of Ninus,¹ the founder of the Assyrian empire at Babylon; and the second preceded Nitocris, the wife of the great Nebuchadnezzar, by five generations,² and consequently was the wife of Nabonassar.³ The former flourished, according to Velleius Paterculus,⁴ B. C. 1817; and the latter, according to the famous era of Nabonassar, B. C. 746, *long after the foundation of Tyre*. Now Troy was besieged by the Greeks, B. C. 1280. If, therefore, we deduct the era of the siege of Troy from that of Semiramis, the wife of Ninus, we have an intermediate period, between the first Semiramis and the siege of Troy, of 537 years. In like manner the era of the second Semiramis, being deducted from that of the siege of Troy, leaves an intermediate period of 534 years. Hence it is somewhat probable that Porphyry confounded the two queens, or that, being desirous of depreciating the writings of Moses, he wilfully assumed the latter queen to have been nearly his contemporary. Now, admitting the ignorance or falsehood of Porphyry's assumption, the artifice of a controversial writer; whose business it was to make the best of a doubtful case, cannot affect the authenticity of Sanchoniatho's history. Supposing, therefore, that Sanchoniatho lived during the reign of Semiramis, the wife of Nabonassar, i. e. B. C. 746, he might flatter the vanity of the Phœnicians by placing the foundation of Tyre in the remotest ages of their history. The same vanity is detected in several Greek and Roman writers of acknowledged credit; and consequently, in spite of this objection, his general

¹ Justin. lib. i. c. 2. Diod. Sic. lib. ii. c. 4.

² Herod. lib. i. c. 184. lib. ii. c. 142.

³ Larcher, Chron. Herod. tom. vii. p. 171. cf. Fourmont, Reflex. Crit. sur les Histoires, &c. lib. i. p. 66. The blunder of Tournemine, in confounding generations with centuries, escaped the sagacity of Fourmont.

⁴ Vell. Paterc. lib. i. c. 6.

character as an historian ought to stand on as good foundations: but unfortunately for the present question, the Phœnician annals have been lost, and nothing remains but some scattered notices of the Greek writers. The name of Abibaal, however, occurs in a treatise of Josephus,¹ by whom he is described as the father of Hiram, king of Tyre; whereas the Abibaal, to whom Sanchoniatho dedicated his history, was the king of Berytus. Hence Berytus being an independent state, another difficulty arises, unless we suppose with Athenæus² that Sanchoniatho was a Tyrian. But though this name might be used comprehensively for the Phœnicians, it would be imprudent to conclude on such grounds, that he was contemporary with David, who lived several centuries before the time of Semiramis, the wife of Nabonassar. We shall, therefore, state our reasons for affixing a much later date, than the time of David, as the probable era at which Sanchoniatho flourished: for as there may be some truth in Porphyry's assertion, that he lived during the reign of Semiramis, i. e. about the era of Nabonassar, we must be influenced, in forming our conclusions, by the comparative facility, with which an idolater could obtain records from a priest of the god Jevo, or *Jehovah*, at the different epochs of David and Nabonassar.

The reign of David, being remarkable for a strict observance of the Mosaic institutions, precludes the supposition, that encouragement would be given to an idolatrous Phœnician: much less can we suppose, that a Jewish priest would impart the history of his country, when the only sources were the works of Moses and the national records. But these were held so sacred,³ except in times of national apostacy, that the Septuagint translation was deemed a great public misfortune. If, therefore, we admitted, that Sanchoniatho lived during the reign of David, we must suppose, that the Phœnicians had obtained some copies of the Pentateuch, while the Jews were governed by their judges. But then the physical solution of the origin of the world, for which his theology is famous, is much too subtle and ingenious for these early times; besides, the mercantile pursuits of the Phœnicians before the time of David, their love of emigration, and the frequent necessity of discharging their population on foreign countries, afforded neither

¹ Joseph. contra Apion. lib. i. c. 17. Huds.

² Athen. Deipnos. lib. iii. c. 37.

³ Marsham, Chron. Sæc. 9. Le Clerc, Bibl. Anc. et Mod. tom. xxv. 335 sq.

taste nor leisure for studying nature, and deducing philosophical conclusions on her origin. Hence we may safely conjecture, that arithmetic and nautical astronomy,¹ being serviceable in trade, were the only sciences cultivated in Phœnicia at this early period; and consequently, that the combination of philosophy and physics, by which Sanchoniatho explains the cosmogony, must be attributed to a much later age.

On the other hand, the era of Nabonassar presented but few obstacles to the historical researches of a Phœnician. The marriage of Ahab to a Phœnician princess had introduced the Phœnician idolatry. In his reign the Levitical priesthood, complying with the fashion of the court, had bowed the knee to Baal, with whose priests they had formed a close connexion. An amalgamation of religious notions was the consequence; and accordingly the Mosaic account of the creation would be little regarded, or, if regarded at all, would be explained according to the gross conceptions of idolaters. Hence we find the writings of Thoth or Taautus received with religious veneration in the East, not because they contained the truth, but because the supposed truths they contained exactly corresponded with prevailing superstitions. The death of Ahab was followed by a succession of apostacies; and if truth prevailed for a period, it was only to be corrupted by some greater relapse. At length, in the reign of Ahaz, who was contemporary with Semiramis, the wife of Nabonassar, Phœnician superstition obtained its triumph, when the king sacrificed his son to Moloch,² to avert the dangers with which his kingdom was threatened. At this period, therefore, Sanchoniatho might receive some records from Hierombaal, an apostate priest of the god Jevo, or Jehovah; whereas in the time of Semiramis, the wife of Ninus, the Jews had not begun to be a people. But the strongest confirmation of our opinion is, the knowledge, that an account of the cosmogony had been circulated in Greece by Hesiod before the time of Semiramis, the wife of Nabonassar. From whence he obtained it, is a matter of surmise; but, like the other arts and sciences, it most probably came from Egypt, and consequently was derived from the reputed writings of Thoth or Taautus, the great fountain of Grecian philosophy.

This celebrated personage, however, once so famous in the history of the East, as the inventor of the arts and sciences, has furnished Dodwell with another objection. But this alleged con-

¹ Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.* tom. i. c. 6. p. 229.

² 2 Kings xvi. 3. Cf. *Sanch. ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. i. c. 10. p. 40 C.* Bryant's *Ancient Mythol.* vol. vi. p. 323 sq.

tradition of the Greek writers may be easily explained from history. For though Taautus, Thoth, or Theutates, whom Sanchoniatho in his *Genealogies* describes as a Phœnician, is generally regarded as an Egyptian deity; the fact that he was as famous among the Gauls and Germans,¹ as in the civilised regions of Greece and Egypt, would lead us to suspect that, instead of an Egyptian sage who invented letters, this pretended divinity was purely symbolical. Indeed, the signification of the name² is alone sufficient to confirm this opinion; for the Hebrew word *תוֹת*, *signa*, which is commonly pronounced *othoth*, signifies signs. The pillars which were attributed to Thoth,³ or the first Hermes, contained inscriptions in the sacred characters of Egypt. Now these pillars, on which the Egyptians inscribed their inventions, were called *Thuothi* or *Thyothi*,⁴ and served for signs; or at least they had artificial signs or words engraved on them from whence they might derive their name. Accordingly, when the memory of their first erection was obliterated, they might be attributed to some imaginary personage, who obtained the name of Thoth from the pillars. In this case the inscriptions on the pillars might be copied; and being extremely ancient, might be circulated as his reputed writings, long before the time of Sanchoniatho: hence they were probably brought by Agenor from Egypt, when he founded Tyre, or were known to the Philistines, an Egyptian colony⁵ on the southern coast of Palestine. Sanchoniatho, therefore, as the historian of Phœnicia, whose people were partly descended from Mesraim the ancestor of the Egyptians, and partly from Ham the common parent of both nations, had some reason for considering Thoth, or Taautus, a Phœnician; though it is much more probable that, being placed by Manetho before the deluge, he was purely a symbolical character. Nor is the positive manner in which the invention of letters is attributed to Thoth or Hermes, by the Greek writers,⁶ so conclusive a proof of his having really existed, as some learned and ingenious writers imagined:⁷ for they only repeated the substance of traditions, which they had

¹ Luc. Pharsal. lib. i. 445. Bannier, *Mythol. Expliquée*, tom. i. pp. 16. 41. Boch. *Geogr. Sacra*, p. 662.

² Hist. Verit. des Temps Fabul. tom. i. p. 239.

³ Manetho ap. Syncelli Chron. p. 40.

⁴ Jablonski, *Panth. Ægypt.* p. lv. p. 180. Larcher, *Suppl. à la Philos. de l'Hist.* pp. 251, 252.

⁵ Gen. x. 40.

⁶ Plat. *Phileb.* tom. iii. p. 146. Bekker.

⁷ M. Bailly de l'Astron. Anc. p. 319. Cudw. *Intell. Syst.* vol. ii. p. 128. 8vo.

collected in Egypt, whereas several other nations' have disputed with the Egyptians the invention of the alphabetic characters. At least the use of letters in Edom is attested by Job,² a contemporary with Jacob,³ and the most ancient author in existence; while the era of Thoth, being antecedent to the deluge, is so extravagantly ancient, as to destroy his claim to the invention. Hence, admitting that they were brought by Agenor from Egypt, when he settled in Phœnicia, it is highly probable, in the absence of more ancient testimony than the book of Job, that Egypt was indebted to other countries for the invention; and consequently, the claim of so doubtful a personage as Thoth must be questioned, until the era, at which he lived, is confirmed by undoubted records.

Hence we have some reasons for concluding, that Sanchoniatho's history is not a forgery, but the production of a much later writer, than is usually supposed. The opinion, that he flourished in the time of Gideon, being founded on a resemblance of names, is altogether improbable: for the chronological contradictions are so numerous and flagrant, as to admit of no satisfactory adjustment. Accordingly, we must look to a later period, which may somewhat agree with the observations of Porphyry, and remove the various objections of modern writers. Now Porphyry asserts, that Abibaal and Semiramis were contemporaries: hence, as the reign of David preceded Semiramis by several centuries, Abibaal, the father of Hiram and contemporary of David, cannot be the king of Berytus, to whom Sanchoniatho dedicated his history. The Phœnician annals having perished, conjecture must supply what the works of Dios and Menander alone could have satisfactorily confirmed. We therefore suspect, that a Phœnician king of this name was contemporary with Semiramis, the wife of Nabonassar; and consequently, that Sanchoniatho flourished about 746 years before the Christian era. In this case the foundation of Tyre might be mentioned as an event of remote antiquity, the memory of which was uncertain at so great a distance of time. Accordingly, we should not be surprised, that Sanchoniatho, like the Greek writers, in treating of their national antiquities, has indulged that love of fable, in which all nations have involved their origin.

¹ Diod. Sic. lib. v. c. 74. Tacit. Annal. lib. xi. c. 14. Plin. lib. v. c. 13. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. c. 16.

² Job xix. 23, 24. xxxi. 35.

³ Goguet, Diss. sur le Livre de Job, p. 405 sq.

If, however, the authenticity of Sanchoniatho has been disputed by Dodwell and Meiners, he has found ingenious advocates in Cumberland, Fourmont, and Bochart. Among the latter, Cumberland was the first, who undertook to show a conformity between Moses and the Phœnician historian: the great coincidences, which he labours to prove, are the creation, the primitive condition of mankind, and the number of generations between the creation and the deluge. But unfortunately for his theory, the last event is entirely omitted by Sanchoniatho; and consequently, both Cumberland, and the writers who have followed him, have arbitrarily placed it in the tenth generation, without a corresponding trait to justify so bold a conjecture: hence they are compelled to find a resemblance between the ancient patriarchs¹ and the different personages, who are mentioned in Sanchoniatho's Genealogies. But as this system is liable to many serious objections, and at best has nothing but conjecture, founded on occasional etymologies, to support it, we view it rather as an ingenious effort of learning than as a sagacious approximation to truth: for supposing (what we are by no means ready to admit), that a great conformity exists between the sacred and profane historian, we should be led to conclude, that Sanchoniatho either followed the Mosaic narrative, or consulted the same sources of information. In the former case, the conformity would be clear and marked, when they treated of such memorable events as the creation and the deluge; whereas the one is physically explained by the Phœnician, and the other is altogether omitted. In the latter, they might casually disagree on events of minor importance; but then the disagreement would preserve such a partial conformity, as evinces the same source of information. Or admitting the probability, that Sanchoniatho had access to the works of Moses, it is doubtful, whether he would use them in a theological treatise, their character being such, that an idolater would reject their authority: for when he found the religion of his ancestors proscribed, and the extirpation of his countrymen commanded with the solemnity of a legal sanction, the severity of the sentence would excite no favorable impression towards the Jewish lawgiver. Hence he would collect the traditions on the creation of the world, which had existed beyond the memory of man, among surrounding nations. If, therefore, these traditions ascribed a beginning to the present system of

¹ Fourmont, *Refl. Crit. sur les Hist. des Anc. Peup.* lib. ii. p. 19 sq.

nature, the remains of primitive truth, which have long since perished in the tide of ages, would embarrass a Pagan philosopher. The ideas presented by historical facts would be physically explained: but still the feeble light, which had glimmered through the darkness of superstition, was too clear to be extinguished at once; and consequently it would impart to his speculations a degree of truth, which Moses alone had preserved uncorrupted.

These opinions, notwithstanding their probability, have been doubted by several learned men: but they seem to have forgotten, that the length of human life, in the primitive ages of the world, enabled mankind to preserve traditions unimpaired by the lapse of ages. In the family of Abraham, for instance, tradition, had not passed through so many mouths, as to become doubtful or suspicious: for Noah must have conversed with Enoch, who being the son of Seth and grandson of Adam, had conversed with the latter during a period of seven hundred years. Accordingly, the primitive tradition of the origin of the world was conveyed to Noah by three mouths. Now Noah died 350 years after the deluge,¹ and Abraham at the time of Noah's death was 59 years old. Isaac conversed with his father 75 years, and Jacob with Isaac 120 years: consequently the primitive tradition of the creation was conveyed from Adam to Jacob by six mouths. Supposing, then, that Sidon was founded A. C. 1730,² the year in which Jacob died, the arrival of Agenor in Phœnicia, and consequent foundation of Tyre, occurred 140 years afterwards; i. e. A. C. 1590. At this period the Phœnicians were possessed of a written language, because they were descended from the Edomites,³ who possessed one in the time of Jacob.⁴ It must therefore be admitted as highly probable, that the Canaanites had preserved some very ancient traditions: for if the length of human life was the same in all countries at this early period of time (and we have no reasons for supposing otherwise), they had the same facility of preserving traditions as the family of Abraham. These traditions, no doubt, were strangely corrupted by the prevalence of polytheism: but, nevertheless, the intervening period between the death of Jacob and the arrival of Agenor in Phœnicia, where letters were known, is not so long as to destroy the probability, that these traditions were committed to writing. Whatever

¹ Larcher, Chron. Herod. vol. vii. p. 130. ² Idem, p. 131 sq.

³ Herod. lib. i. c. 1. lib. vii. c. 89. ⁴ Job xxxi. 35. Goguet, loc. laud.

they might be, the earliest were represented by hieroglyphic painting, and the latest by short inscriptions after the invention of letters. Or supposing the earliest traditions to have been lost in the gloomy darkness of idolatry, the abode of Abraham and his family in Canaan were calculated to restore the truth : for if the Phœnicians were indebted to this patriarch for their knowledge of astronomy,¹ it is more than probable that the origin of the world, being closely connected with it, would be the subject of his conversations with Melchisedech. The traditions, therefore, which were known to Abraham and his family, might be circulated in Canaan, Egypt, and the several countries in which they resided ; and consequently, they might be committed to writing after the death of Jacob, with such interpretations as suited the genius of idolatry.

Hence a traditional coincidence with Scripture is not confined to Sanchoniatho, but extends to all the histories of the East which treat of remote antiquity. In the history of Egypt, for instance; Menes is the first king ; between whom and Noah² an historical conformity exists, sufficient to identify the two persons.

NOAH.

נח quievit ; a name given by Lamech. Gen. c. v. 29.

Noah was the first patriarch, and consequently might be called the first king after the deluge.

In the time of Noah, the earth was covered by a deluge ; from which Noah and his family alone were preserved in the תבה *Thebah*, or ark.

In the time of Noah, the whole world was contained in the תבה *Thebah*, or ark.

After the deluge, Noah was the first who built an altar, and offered up sacrifices to God. Gen. viii. 20.

Noah was permitted to eat of the flesh of animals. Gen. ix. 3.

MENES.

Μενεε permansit ; from whence the word Menes was probably derived, to convey the meaning of the Egyptian name.

Menes was the first king of Egypt. Herod. lib. ii. c. 4.

In the reign of Menes the whole of Egypt was a marsh, excepting the nome of *Thebes*, which signifies an *ark*. Herod. lib. ii. c. 4.

In the reign of Menes all Egypt was comprehended under the name of *Thebes*. Herod. lib. ii. c. 15.

Menes was the first who taught the people to worship, and to offer up sacrifices to the gods. Diod. Sic. lib. i. c. 45.

Menes introduced the delicacies of the table. Diod. Sic. lib. i. c. 45.

¹ Eupol. ap. Euseb. Præp. Ev. lib. ix. c. 17.

² Hist. Verit. des Temps Fab. vol. i. p. 173 sq.

NOAH.

Noah was outraged by his son
Ham. Gen. ix. 21 sq.

MENES.

Menes was defiled by an hippopotamus, the hieroglyphic symbol of an impudent son among the Egyptians. Manetho, ap. Sync. p. 54. Plut. de Solert. Anim. p. 14. Reiskii de Iside et Osir. p. 436. Horus, Hieroglyph. lib. i. p. 53.

Now a coincidence of this kind is sufficient to confirm a belief, that such traditions were committed to writing shortly after the invention of letters; but not so strong as to warrant the conclusion, that the Egyptians, who preserved them, have uniformly followed Moses, or consulted the same sources of information: else how can we reconcile the contradictions in Moses, Manetho, and Herodotus—the 330 kings, for instance, between Menes and Moëris (the Noah and Mesraim of Scripture) with the genealogies in Genesis?

We cannot, therefore, consider a coincidence between Sanchoniatho and the sacred historian, on the primitive condition of man, conclusive in favour of a system, whose analogy on the whole is imperfect. In some respects we admit the coincidence is singular; but notwithstanding the truth is so intermixed with fable, that we may reasonably doubt, whether Sanchoniatho has followed Moses, or consulted the same sources of information. A coincidence in name at first surprises: the surprise instantly confirms some preconceived opinion; and the sudden confirmation prejudices the mind against noticing a difference between two narratives: hence the coincidence is confidently urged, and the difference is unfairly suppressed. Now if coincidences between two authors are just grounds for the adoption of a theory, we maintain, without fear of contradiction, that a difference is legitimate ground of objection: accordingly, it is safer to steer a middle course, *ne plus ei tribuamus, quam res et veritas ipsa concedat*.

But as general observations are inconclusive without particular proof, we shall refer to Sanchoniatho in confirmation of our opinion. The cosmogony, for instance, and the first generation, are as fair examples as the warmest advocate of Cumberland's system can wish. And that the coincidence between the two historians may appear more striking, we shall place their accounts of the creation in two parallel columns, omitting the differences in the Mosaic narrative, which may be easily supplied from memory.

SANCHONIATHO.

* The beginning of the universe was a dark and windy air; or a wind of dark air, and a confused but glimmering chaos. These, moreover, were infinite, and on account of their long duration interminable. But when the Wind* was enamoured of its own principles, and a mixture followed, this conjunction was called Desire. Now this was the beginning of the creation of all things. But the Wind was not aware of its production, i. e. Desire; from whose connexion with the Wind proceeded *Môt*. By *Môt* some understand *mud*, and others the corruption of a watery mixture,* to which the universe and all its creatures owe their production. Now there were certain animals devoid of intelligence, from which proceeded intelligent animals, called *Zophasemin*, i. e. *observers of heaven*. They were formed in shape like an egg; and *Môt*, the Sun and Moon, the less and greater stars shone forth.

When the air had become intensely enlightened, the inflamed state of the sea and earth was the cause of winds, clouds, violent falls of rain, and inundations. After these had parted, and were separated from their proper places, they all met together in the air and clashed with violence. Thunder and lightning ensued; at the sound of which the above-mentioned intelligent animals, being frightened, awoke as it were from sleep, and male and female moved on the earth and in the sea.

From the wind* *Colpias*, and his wife *Baaut*, which is interpreted Night, were begotten *Æon*† and *Protogonus*, both mortals; for they were so called; and *Æon*‡ found out food from trees.

MOSES.

* The earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.

* And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

* And God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that hath life, &c.

* And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. † Eve and Adam.

‡ And when the woman saw, that the tree was good for food, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, &c.

A comparison of these parallel passages suggests no real con-
VOL. XXXIX. Cl. Jl. NO. LXXVIII. T

formity between the two historians, without the aid of etymology. But learning, assisted by this formidable science, has discovered a coincidence in names, to counterbalance the difference between the two narratives. The word Colpias,¹ for instance, in Hebrew קול-פיה col-pi-jah, *vox oris Dei*, is a corruption of Gen. ii. 7. "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" and consequently the wind Colpias is a physical explanation of the breath, or spirit proceeding from the voice of the mouth of God. Æon, in Greek Αἰών, and in Hebrew חַוָּה Chava, *Eva*, the mother of the human race, are words of the same meaning,² signifying life. Protogonus, likewise, in Greek Πρωτόγονος, *first-born*, may agree with Adam, who was called the first man,³ because from אָדָמָה Adama, i. e. *made of earth*. Hence this coincidence is made to warrant the conclusion, that Sanchoniatho confirms the Mosaic account of the temptation, in attributing to Æon the discovery of fruit. Now admitting a coincidence between the word Colpias and קול-פיה col-pi-jah, *vox oris Dei*, we can discover no analogy between the two accounts of the creation, unless the Creator of the world, and the dust, of which man was made, are mystically explained in Sanchoniatho by the generative union of the wind Colpias and Night. But etymology can find no name in this part of the Mosaic narrative, to correspond with בֹּרָה Baaut, *Night*. The analogy, therefore, fails, until the union of these physical beings can be satisfactorily explained by Scripture. Neither can a coincidence between the names of the first pair be alleged as substantial proof of a system, which fails in the analogy of historical facts. The Mosaic narrative, for instance, is brief, but full of important matter. The creation of man, his abode in Eden, the creation of Eve from a rib of Adam, the temptation and fall of our first parents, and their subsequent expulsion from Paradise, are sketched with a rapid but powerful pencil. These events, too striking to escape a diligent historian, are passed over in profound silence by Sanchoniatho. Even the first discovery of fruit is wrongly attributed to Æon: for we cannot suppose that Adam was ignorant of its use, when God, immediately after his creation, had specially revealed it. The notion, therefore, that Sanchoniatho consulted the Mosaic narrative, or used the same sources of information, must be rejected; and consequently the very partial

¹ Boch. Geogr. Sacr. p. 706.

² Grotius de Verit. lib. i. sect. 16, note.

³ Boch. Geogr. Sacr. lib. i. c. 15. p. 51.

coincidence, between the two historians, must be ascribed to the existence of some ancient traditions in Phœnicia.

Hence we consider, that the writers, who explain this fragment by Scripture, have wasted much unnecessary learning, in supporting an objectionable system. Being biassed by particular studies, they have sacrificed truth and consistency, in maintaining preconceived opinions. At different times, as it suits their purpose, Sanchoniatho is made to follow Moses, the traditions of his country, or is inextricably involved in mystery and fable. To remove the difficulties resulting from such different modes of explanation, characters as opposite as the elements are made to agree, with scarcely an imaginary resemblance. Else how is it possible, that Fourmont¹ could boldly assert the identity of Saturn and Abraham, on the supposition alone, that Saturn's sacrifice of his son to Uranus was Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, and his circumcision the circumcision of the patriarchal family? Our scepticism, we confess, is too great to be removed by such chimerical resemblances; for before we admit an identity of *person*, we must be satisfied of some identity of *character*. Who therefore can believe, that a rebel and a parricide, the invader and robber of his father's kingdom, a monster, whose crimes were scarcely equalled by the human sacrifices at his altar, is the same person with Abraham, the peaceable stranger in the land of Canaan? But when we are required,

O rem ridiculam, Cato, et jocosam!

to recognise the haughty and vindictive Juno in the gentle Rebecca,² the lewd features of Astarte, the Phœnician Venus, in the modest and amiable Rachel,³ we suspect that madness is too frequently the effect of learning. The folly of the Jesuit, who gravely concluded, that the Americans were descended from the Greeks, because they danced at their festivals, is nothing to the audacity of Fourmont, in deducing the Phœnician gods from the family of Abraham. The most trivial circumstance is sufficient to establish an identity; and conclusions are urged with such disregard of probability, that if the principle on which they are founded is admitted, we may expect to find in some future mythologist, that an assumption to heaven identifies Elijah and Romulus.

But as we have objected to the systems of Cumberland and Fourmont, it is necessary, before we conclude, to recommend a different method of explaining the Phœnician and Chaldean

¹ Fourmont, *Reflex. Crit. &c. lib. ii. p. 67.*

² *Id. tom. i. p. 97.*

³ *Id. tom. i. p. 160.*

cosmogonies. If this method affords no scope for ingenuity and learning, it neither assumes too much, nor proposes an objectionable hypothesis. In most cases, however, it will prove successful in developing the fables, whose origin must be sought in the corruption of primitive traditions. We would, therefore, explain these ancient cosmogonies, partly as physical, and partly as historical fables. As historical fables, they contain some truth intermixed with falsehood. In rejecting the falsehood, we must carefully preserve the events, with which the truth is connected: for when these events are known, it is easy to account for the allusions to the operations of nature interwoven with historical facts. Having separated the allusions to the operations of nature, i. e. the physical explanations of the author, from the historical facts, we must next determine, whether the former are *real* or *allegorical*. If real, they are simply the philosophical notions of the author; and if allegorical, the agents, unless a divine power is clearly implied, must be resolved into the active and passive causes of nature.

The application of these principles to Sanchoniatho's cosmogony will prove, that its value, as collateral testimony to the truth of Scripture, is comparatively insignificant. For if we subject it to a close analysis, we shall find, that the historical facts are few, or involved in fable. The beginning of the world, for instance, and the existence of animals devoid of feeling or intelligence before the production of man, are truths derived from the primitive traditions preserved by Moses. The latter event, in the book of Genesis, immediately precedes the creation of man: "And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and every thing that creepeth on the earth after his kind." Accordingly, the creation of man may be alluded to under the production of Zophasemin, or observers of heaven. Hence we are inclined to think that the history of Æon and Protogonus, who were begotten by the wind Colpias, is another, but more accurate tradition; and consequently, Sanchoniatho, being ignorant of the relation of these two traditions to each other, has recorded them as distinct and unconnected events.

But if the traditions are few and obscure, the physical explanations of Sanchoniatho will enable us to judge with certainty of the state of philosophy in Phœnicia: for being real and not allegorical, they prove, that the Phœnicians were ignorant of a supreme intellectual governor of the world. The final cause, in their opinion, was love, or that property in nature, by which the generation of plants and animals was begun and continued. A wind of infinite duration and extent, being excited by this

first cause, produced desire, i. e. a disposition in matter to generate. Hence the active causes in the production of nature were love, wind, and a disposition in matter to generate. The passive cause on the other hand was a chaos, also of infinite duration and extent; consequently, the Phœnicians maintained the eternity of matter. The joint influence of wind, and a disposition in matter to generate, having caused the harder and softer substances to unite, the chaos became a liquid mass, to which the world and all its creatures owe their production. Hence, as a presiding reason is excluded in the formation of the world, the present system of nature resulted from a combination of qualities accidentally distributed in matter, but influenced by an inherent disposition to generate. If, therefore, this interpretation is correct, it is difficult to conceive how authors of distinguished learning could infer from this cosmogony, that the knowledge of the true God¹ was not extinct among the Phœnicians. For our part, we can find no grounds for this conclusion, when the superstitions of this idolatrous people are impartially examined. But as this inquiry would lead us into a dissertation of unusual length, we shall endeavour to prove in some future Number, that the worship of the true God was extinguished among ancient nations; and but for its miraculous preservation among the Jews, it must have remained so, in spite of the utmost efforts of human reason.

BIBLIOTHECA SUSSEXIANA; a Descriptive Catalogue, accompanied by Historical and Biographical Notices, of the Manuscripts and Printed Books contained in the Library of H. R. H. the DUKE OF SUSSEX, in Kensington Palace. By T. J. PETTIGREW, F.R.S., F.L.S., F.A.S., &c. &c. &c. Vol. I. Parts I. and II. Imperial 8vo. and Royal 4to. London, Longman.

THE reigning taste for library-making, now cultivated with so much emulation amongst our higher orders, has undoubtedly its weak side; and collectors must always expect to encounter a

¹ Meiners, *Hist. Doctr. de vero Deo*, p. 63 sq.

not undeserved ridicule, while they dwell with childish ecstasies on uncut leaves, large paper copies, wide margins, and even the precious blunders that stamp a factitious value on some unique or rare, but otherwise worthless book. With all their foibles, however, they are at the same time effecting a great and a permanent good, which will redeem the character of their pursuit in the estimation of the liberal and the wise. We do not refer solely to the encouragement which literature in general derives from their patronage, or to the credit and high repute into which learning is brought by their example. Even these, the perhaps too fugitive results of a mutable and uncertain caprice, are still not to be despised; and as the luxury is both too costly and too refined ever to descend to the vulgar, or rather as it may be said to devulgarise all that it touches; it will probably retain its vogue beyond the brief term of a mere fashionable whim, and long constitute one of the most honorable distinctions of wealth and rank. But our view of the benefit accruing from it extends beyond the contracted horizon of the present. We look forward to the effects of the impulse thus given to a long inert and useless mass; we discern the remote consequences of the keen and active search which is now going forward amongst hitherto concealed stores of early manuscripts; we anticipate the use that will be made of the as yet much neglected fruits of foreign study; we foresee the eventual diffusion of that knowledge which time will extract from the hidden sources of information thus laid open; and we calculate on the effectual assistance which will be afforded to inquiring minds in their fearless pursuit and patient development of historic truth. This subject is at the present moment so highly important and interesting, that a few remarks on it may be not inappropriately introduced here, to preface our examination of the Catalogue, in which Mr. Pettigrew has described a part of that valuable and truly princely library, formed by His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex.

That the world is beginning to be conscious of having long taken too much for granted, on the authority of those who have pretended to be its instructors, is a truth which every day renders more clearly apparent. It is almost impossible to fix on a portion of ancient history, which, when thoroughly investigated, we can satisfactorily declare that we believe in the form in which it has been transmitted to us. Even those events which we have been accustomed to regard as most indubitable, have been so disguised by fable, and so colored either by national pride or party prejudice, that, without the nicest discrimination,

their genuine and undistorted features can never be ascertained. The modern teachers of mankind have given the name of classics to a certain set of old books, which they have agreed to exalt as standards of perfect excellence; they have made them the basis of all knowledge, and the mere ability to read them the sum of a good education. Erroneous as many of the statements in these works must necessarily be from their very nature, and questionable as they are rendered, either by the circumstances under which they were originally drawn up, or by the manner in which they have been handed down to later times, still they have been generally admitted, not only without hesitation, but even with religious acquiescence, as credible and trustworthy records. So much indeed has this been looked on as matter of course, that rarely has there been found a preceptor who deemed it necessary to point out to his disciples the fallacies, the incongruities, and the contradictions of the narratives which he placed in their hands. Critical inquiry into the facts detailed was held to be superfluous; the active fancy and ardent enthusiasm of youth were left to expatiate among them, undirected and unrestrained: a classical quotation, like a text of holy writ, confirmed, elucidated, sanctioned, every thing; and if at any time philosophical reflections were indulged, implicit faith in the transactions described was the preliminary ground on which they invariably proceeded. Religion alone could set bounds to this credulity: no manifestations of supernatural power could be admitted ever to have taken place, without weakening the authority and the basis of the Christian church. Hence arose an obvious necessity for subverting the authority of the miracles of heathenism, or at least for giving the character of natural occurrences to all the legendary exploits of its deified heroes and immortal gods. Yet so powerfully has the force of habit or the influence of education prevailed in some minds, that there have not been wanting instances of Christian writers, who are still regarded as learned men and eminent divines, who have gravely argued for the truth of some even of these miracles, and have maintained that on such occasions the Supreme Being has actually interfered, in order to vindicate, for the sake of true religion, even the violated sanctity of pagan rites.¹ With this exception, the evidence of classical

¹ A remarkable assertion of this doctrine closes Dr. Prideaux's account of the destruction of the Gauls who attacked the Delphian temple. "Thus was God pleased," he says, "in a very extraordinary manner, to execute his vengeance on these sacrilegious wretches for the sake of religion in general; how false and idolatrous soever that

authors on matters of fact has been generally received without distrust ; and so little room have their works been supposed to afford for doubt, investigation, or dispute, that by far the most frequent use made of them has been merely to acquire a knowledge of the languages in which they are written. To this end have the labors of public schools been exclusively directed ; Greek and Latin have been studied for themselves alone ; parsing and scanning, genders and quantities, are the momentous subjects that have engrossed the scholar's mind ; the pages of Herodotus and Livy have been conned over, not for the purpose of deriving from them clear ideas of the events which they narrate, but for that of noticing some variety of dialect, some rule of grammar, some peculiarity of style ; and when the aching eye has carried its toilsome search through the double columns of closely printed notes that accompany the text, it has only found enumerated there the various readings of different editions, and contests about accents, letters, and tenses, any of which might be adopted without materially affecting the meaning of the passages where they belong. A few only of these works having been selected, by the fastidiousness of taste, as models of composition, and the rest being thrown into the shade and neglected, not only has the student not been trained to the habit of comparing the opposite statements of different historians, but his mind has been early imbued with a prejudice, the lasting influence of which has always been subversive of impartiality, and fatal to an honest estimate of conflicting authorities : purity of style has been preferred to weight of matter ; and thus, instead of regarding languages only as keys to the information stored in books, books have only been used as necessary implements in fabricating a competent knowledge of the languages in which they are clothed. And this is called classical education ! These are the materials which have long been supplied by pædagogic rule, for transmitting from generation to generation established doctrines, and perpetuating the leaden sway of an artificial, dull, unprofitable learning. Crammed, by the potent aid of birch and Duke Humphrey, with daily rations of this inflating, unsubstantial food, the sleek and pampered bantling of the schools was at last handed over to his university tutor : fixed in the mathema-

particular religion was, for which that temple at Delphos was erected. For to believe a religion true, and offer sacrilegious violences to the places consecrated to the devotions of that religion, is absolute impiety, and a sin against all religion ; and there are many instances of very signal judgments with which God hath punished it, even amongst the worst of heathens and infidels."—*Prideaux's Connection*, vol. ii. p. 21.

tical go-cart, he learned to strut with imposing gravity his measured steps along the beaten track: all his previous acquirements, all his intellectual faculties, were carefully cramped and squeezed by the Procrustian mould of orthodoxy into a strict conformity with ancient precedent. Fellowships and canonries, rich livings and prebendal stalls, priories, abbacies, deaneries and bishoprics, cardinals' caps and pontificates, were the rewards of passive, docile pupils; while the terrors of the Inquisition, or awful denunciations against schismatics and heretics, quelled at once the incipient struggles of refractory talent; and at length, fashioned by this discipline, the dignified pedant of the college became, with little change, the pedantic dignitary of the church.

The fruits matured by this course of training have been—spiritual pride, domineering sophistry and substantial ignorance, shallow conceptions of all that regards the past history of our race, and the universal dogmatism of artificial principles in taste, literature, science, and art. Genius was tied down by arbitrary laws to a servile imitation of antique models. Imagination was held in constant leading-strings, and forbidden to deviate from the well-tracked road. Reason was cased in a panoply of buckram, that gave her indeed an aspect of mock stateliness, but served only to encumber all her movements and impede her own progress. The cold affectation and impudent quackery of a nerveless erudition predominated in every species of writing. Stiff, old-fashioned images, unnatural similes, and worn-out allegories, composed the charms of poetry; tedious declamation and formal unities constituted the only *legitimate* drama; history was made up either of dull repetition or absurd invention; rhetoric degenerated into set phraseology and turgid bombast; philosophy vaped in the unmeaning distinctions of a fine-spun casuistry; and theology dilated into folio tomes of paraphrastic commentaries, verbose dispute, and cold observation: all passion was calmly studied—all feeling deliberately assumed—all grace demurely spiritless, and all expression constrained and insincere.

Against this artificial system nature and truth have for some time waged an arduous contest, with slow, but still with progressive success. For the honor of our own country let it be said, that, although a large part of her institutions, many of her habits, and most of her prejudices, were from the beginning enlisted, and are yet arrayed in defence of these errors; still it is here that the struggle against them first commenced, and has been prosecuted with the greatest vigor. The native spirit and

energy of the Gothic character, self-taught and self-sustained, were displayed in the earliest compositions of our Saxon ancestors; and from that source we derived an originality of thought, which was never wholly extinct among us. Repressed during long ages by the overbearing influence of papal Rome, it was only at distant intervals and by fitful gleams that the smothered fire betrayed its unwilling and "grim repose;" the national resolve to shake off that intolerable yoke was its first decided and successful effort. Overweening power was thus effectually restrained and checked in the last and widest stretch of the most arrogant pretensions which it ever put forth; and the public mind of England, released from a worse than Babylonian captivity, learned the important lessons, that tyranny is not omnipotent, and that resistance is no crime. The contemplation of so great and novel a victory led to reflections on the means by which it had been achieved: individual talent began to measure the depth, and the strength, and the copiousness of its own resources, against those capricious regulations by which opinionated censors had presumed to limit the scope of its exertions; and conscious ability, disdaining obedience to usurped authority, resolutely passed the barriers of the untried and forbidden world. Either from happy ignorance or with bold contempt, Shakspeare broke through the frigid laws of the artificial school, and gave expression to the honest warmth of excited feelings in the plain and glowing language of the heart. Bacon, with a keen and courageous sagacity, detected the systematic fallacies by which reason had been long bewildered; and taught mankind, by following the simple light of nature, to deduce from substantial realities the sound and vigorous philosophy of fact. The influence of these examples was slowly felt; but wherever the new principles which they inculcated were once admitted, they made an indelible impression. The impulse was given, and could not be recalled—the conflict was begun; but the established doctrines had gained too complete an ascendancy—had ruled with too long and too absolute a dominion, to be easily dethroned. They had blended so intimately with the whole existing frame of society—they had insinuated themselves so deeply into the general habits of every class—they wielded so tremendous a power over the hopes and fears, the interests and consciences of all, that it would have been impossible to compass their sudden overthrow, without involving in confusion and ruin the entire fabric, of which they seemed to form an essential and integral part. But as generations pass away, opinions are modified, errors insensibly lose their ground, and truth by degrees

prevails. The study of physics necessarily advanced, on account of its practical tendency to increase the comforts and refine the enjoyments of man; the more generally the stores of creation were known and understood, the more various were the purposes of common utility to which they were found applicable; and in proportion to the increase of attention bestowed on these pursuits, the artificial system was shaken and impaired. Natural history and experimental philosophy have made us familiar with the unchangeable properties of matter and the uniform operation of fixed laws; close observation has induced the process of strict analysis, and habituated the mind to trace the invariable connexion between effect and cause; the empire of delusion, conceit, and artifice, has been reduced within narrower limits; and although the supremacy of nature and truth is still far from being universally acknowledged, yet there is no department of human knowledge in which their claims have not been powerfully asserted, and evident approaches made towards a full recognition of their long disputed rights. During the last fifty years, the progress of this change has been greatly accelerated by the most brilliant and useful discoveries in every walk of science; mechanical forces, the evolutions of chemistry, and all the occult energies of inanimate bodies, have in that period been rendered widely subservient to human convenience: these advantages have opened the minds of men to correct views of universal physiology, and trained them to a more extended application of those general principles which the philosophy of fact has developed and confirmed. The effects of this revolution are every where discernible: at all points we see attention directed more and more from the shadow to the substance, from words to things; inquiry is less satisfied with skimming the surface; all subjects are more acutely reasoned on, and more thoroughly investigated; and authority has fewer opportunities of assuming its dictatorial tone in order to brow-beat modest doubt.

Education societies, mechanics' institutes, and public libraries,¹ are spreading information through the whole mass of society; and even those high seminaries, which still persist in

¹ By public libraries we here understand, not the buried wealth of colleges and chapters, but books which are truly the property of and accessible to the public. None of our most thriving mercantile communities are now destitute of such establishments. We are acquainted with some of these, and have seen the catalogues of others, which are highly creditable proofs of a liberal and enlightened spirit every where following in the train of successful commerce.

exclusively appropriating their most honorable distinctions and best rewards to mathematical and classical proficiency, are beginning to be sensible that these two favored sciences can no longer be regarded as the ultimate and satisfactory ends of all learning, but as means to be subsequently employed for the attainment of something more solid and more intrinsically useful. No man can now sit down contented with his medals and his wranglership, his A.M. and D.D., thinking that he has reached the utmost goal, and may thenceforth enjoy a dignified repose beneath the shade of his acquired laurels. To *know* Greek and Latin is no longer sufficient—it is also necessary to *know how to make use of them*: nor can great reputations now be built up by a happy knack at working abstruse problems in the complicated apparatus of algebra and fluxions; it is also requisite that this skill should not be unprofitably wasted in the computation of imaginary and abstract quantities, but that it should be rendered conducive to some definite and tangible object. So also it is universally admitted, that the last thirty years have produced a great change in the deliberations of the House of Commons, and in the character of the eloquence that commands attention in that assembly; and this change, in order to soothe the inwardly wounded pride of aristocracy, has been attributed to that increasing pressure of parliamentary business, which leaves public men no time to listen to rhetorical display: but to our view it is another and a very strong symptom of a growing disposition to estimate the value of talent by the extent of the services which it actually performs; and hence it is, that plain matter of fact lucidly arranged and leading to practical conclusions, has been substituted for the speculative refinements of a Burke, and produces more effect than even a Sheridan's most highly-wrought and polished harangues.

In this struggle between natural and artificial principles, between truth and fallacy, we are now arrived at a point, whence we look back with excited curiosity, to ascertain the origin of that accumulated mass of error, from which the human mind is still endeavoring to set itself free; and it appears to be essential to the farther progress and final completion of this great work, that we should acquire more correct ideas of the past history of the world—that we should be better informed with respect to the early growth of communities—and that we should know more, as well of the circumstances under which their habits evolved and their institutions grew up, as of those under which the inheritance was transmitted to us. While engaged in these researches, we perceive with astonishment

how imperfect are the notions which generally prevail on these subjects—that fact and fable, tradition and mythology, history and poetry, have been blended together in discordant, heterogeneous, dazzling confusion; and that even the mutilated documents from which the whole has been gathered, have been only partially studied, negligently collated, and superficially understood. M. Niebuhr, in his *History of Rome*, has shown us what may be done even with the extant materials that are already within our reach; while the Abbate Mai has successfully pointed out the means of increasing our stock of them; by a judicious scrutiny of ancient manuscripts, and a careful restoration of defaced records. No human sagacity can divine the extent to which such labors may be profitably carried. The fragments of the writings of antiquity, which have descended to us, fall far short of what has been lost; and from the references and quotations made during the middle ages, we have reason to hope that much of what is deficient may still exist buried in some remote and unexplored corner, in immured libraries or obscure convents. Every recovered page of such an historian as Polybius would shed a guiding light over those dark portions of the past, of which he is the only faithful annalist; and there are periods, of which we know comparatively nothing, which have still exercised a ruling influence over the course of events, and fixed the destinies of unborn generations. Such, for instance, was the era of the Ptolemies. Under their auspices, learning and learned men of all countries, religions, sects, and schools, experienced a generous and honorable patronage; Hebrew theology was engrafted on Greek philosophy; and the germ of a mighty revolution was left to be nurtured and unfolded by the hand of time. These transactions of a series of years, as eventful and important as any that have occupied the attention of the inquirer, have been treated as a mere episode to the main story: a veil of neglect appears to have been almost studiously thrown over them; and, as if the destruction of the great library of Alexandria had rendered hopeless every effort of the kind, no attempts have been made to illustrate the literary history of that splendid metropolis, or to ascertain the pursuits and the doctrines of the various academies founded and protected there by its intelligent rulers.

The principal difficulty by which we are stopped on the very threshold of this and similar investigations, is the want of satisfactory documents. Can this want be supplied? Few will venture to answer such a question with the decided negative of hopeless abandonment, while so many hoards of unexamined

manuscripts are known to exist in other countries, and we may perhaps also add even in our own; for, comparatively speaking, little advantage has hitherto been derived from the recondite stores possessed by some of our oldest and most splendidly endowed institutions. From these various sources it may reasonably be hoped, that much which is at present deficient may be eventually extracted: in this process we see no agent likely to be so effectually instrumental, as our prevailing bibliomania; and it is this tendency which in our estimation gives an important character even to the most frivolous extravagancies of this fashionable pursuit. Early manuscripts are so extensively sought after, and so high is the value attached to them, that wherever they exist they cannot long remain concealed; in these stirring times it is impossible that such lucrative commodities should escape the keen researches of busy traffickers: the feelers of English commerce will penetrate into their most distant hiding-places; and, when discovered, the charms of English gold will draw them forth to enrich the libraries of eminent collectors. There are few certainly among these individuals who are at all prepared to make that use of their treasures, to which we confidently anticipate, that they will sooner or later be applied: yet what the enlightened and the liberal will perform from a wish to diffuse knowledge, the weak and the vain will be led to imitate by the influence of example, and the pride of displaying their possessions. Catalogues of them will by degrees be published; and although we may at first be required to bestow much of our admiration on the quaint devices and brilliant coloring of illuminated vellum, yet we may cheerfully submit to this tax on our patience, while it is the price we must pay for original and valuable information. The industrious student will thus be directed to new sources of intelligence; the first and greatest difficulty will be overcome—he will know where to look for his materials: titles will guide him to the contents which he wants to explore; access to them will be gradually facilitated; and every fresh discovery which he makes will stimulate to persevering research and lead to ulterior truths. Nor ought he to be disappointed and deterred by the insufferable trash which he will sometimes meet with: even the idlest and most trifling lucubrations may in some instances possess at least a negative value, and reward his labors by assisting to prove on how weak a foundation some currently received opinions rest.

We are as yet in a very early stage of this progress; and should therefore feel ourselves the more beholden to those

who are clearing the ground, and opening the way for future improvement. The high prices which it is understood that ancient manuscripts may now command, are so many premiums offered for the discovery of new sources of knowledge: to collect an extensive library on this principle, and generously grant a facility of reference to its rich stores, is one of the highest benefits that can be conferred on society—one of the noblest and most enviable uses of the gifts of fortune.

Among those who have early taken a decided part in this honorable course, no one is so pre-eminently distinguished as the Duke of Sussex. His Royal Highness has long stood foremost on all occasions, as the willing and judicious promoter of every benevolent and enlightened public undertaking. Whenever the countenance of exalted rank has been wanted to give efficacy to unexclusive and liberal principles in religion or in politics—whenever the arts have needed a protector, science a patron, or the interests of humanity a generous advocate, the Duke of Sussex has never forsaken his post, even under the most unpromising circumstances and in the worst of times. While these pursuits were in the highest degree unfashionable, while the jealous eye of dominant prejudice was intently occupied in watching his steps, and the sneers of triumphant narrow-mindedness affected to scorn, as a visionary folly, the attempt to improve mankind, he persevered without ostentation in his career of usefulness; and has accomplished much good, without rendering himself obnoxious to the charge of courting popularity, or involving himself in the vexatious tactics of party hostility. Yet even those who have been most benefited by the exertions of His Royal Highness, have never till of late justly appreciated the motives by which he was actuated; for a long time they were satisfied with ascribing his conduct to the natural impulses of a frank and amiable disposition, without looking more deeply into the workings of a strong and cultivated mind; they were ignorant of the extent to which this illustrious prince had himself carried those studies, the successful prosecution of which he encouraged and honored in others; they knew not that, while either the singular parsimony of the ministers of the crown, or his own disinterested forbearance, had restricted the income of His Royal Highness far below that of the other branches of his family, still out of these comparatively straitened means he was employing no inconsiderable part in forming that library, which has become the ornament and the treasure of Kensington Palace. A circumstance, which reflects so much honor on the Duke of Sussex, could

not long remain concealed ; nor, if it could, ought it to be left unrecorded and unproclaimed. The nation has a public interest in the character of its princes ; and in an age when the necessity of applying high stimulants to the sated appetite of luxury leads so many of our nobles wantonly to stake their fortunes on the chances of the gaming-table and the jockeyship of the race-course, it is delightful and salutary to contemplate in the highest order of the state this bright instance of a rational and enlightened use of the advantages derived from wealth and rank. In this point of view the example of His Royal Highness cannot be without effect ; but its importance to the cause of public instruction and the diffusion of useful knowledge is immense and incalculable. The influence of princely tastes and the impulse of royal habits must necessarily be more widely felt, and more efficiently active, than those which result from the exertions and predilections of private individuals. It will perhaps be thought that in saying this we have gratuitously uttered a very common-place truism ; be it so—yet truism as it is, so seldom have the prevailing frivolities and vices of courts allowed us to hear it with pleasure or to reflect on it with satisfaction, that we may well claim the indulgence of repeating it, when for once we are enabled to found on it a gratifying and not unreasonable hope ; and while in one instance we see the grossest superstition encouraged by a titled pretender to miraculous power, and in another hear a semi-barbarian despot tell the professors of his most eminent university that he wanted them to educate for him not learned men, but obedient subjects, it is a relief to turn from the contemplation of such absurdities to the contrast afforded by one of our own princes. If, on the one hand, the malignant principle be capable of retarding the advance of knowledge, we have, on the other hand, a devout Magian faith in the final triumph of countervailing good : we zealously believe that the Ahriman of ignorance and falsehood will eventually fall before the Ormusd of instruction and of truth ; and we are the more strongly confirmed in our belief by seeing, in the universal testimony of history, how much may be accomplished by a single enlightened sovereign, earnestly employing his superior advantages to promote the cultivation of letters and the growth of science. In our own times, the ruler of a petty German dukedom, by his patronage of literature and the honors conferred on his Wielands and Goethes, has given to the public mind of that empire an energetic tone, which whole dynasties of Francisces, aided by cabinets of Metternichs, may vainly endeavor to repress... Nor have many

centuries elapsed, since a junior prince of the Burgundian line in Portugal, by study and activity combined, aroused that spirit of maritime adventure, and led the way to those voyages of discovery, which have opened new worlds to commercial enterprise, and remodelled the fabric of European society. There is, perhaps, at this time as much unknown or imperfectly explored ground in ancient history, as that which the untracked surface of the globe presented to intrepid navigators in the days of Prince Henry of Viseu; and chimerical as the idea of making ourselves acquainted with the former may now be deemed by many, not less hopeless did the timid and quiescent minds of the fifteenth century consider those infant attempts, which at last were crowned with a success far surpassing even the most sanguine expectations of their original projectors. The ill-constructed vessels and coast-trained mariners, sent out from the little port of Sagrez, were means apparently very inadequate to the immense objects ultimately accomplished. But the interest taken in the cause by the intelligent prince who superintended the fitting out of these armaments, turned the attention of a then spirited people to nautical pursuits; and the foresight which directed the course of his adventurous squadrons, prepared the way for Gama and Columbus "through seas where sail was never spread before." That the parallelism of the two cases will continue to hold good, even in their remotest consequences, is more than human reason may presume to foretell; but as far as experience and observation, while anticipating the course of events, may be said to

attain

To something like prophetic strain,

so far we may be justified in predicting, that the example and the influence of the Duke of Sussex will effect changes corresponding in importance with those which analogous causes have heretofore produced. The library of Kensington, like the dock-yards of Sagrez, will provide bold inquirers with the means of exploring the vast and trackless field that invites their researches; and wealth, beyond the spices of the East or the gold of the West, will reward their toils, for they will bring back with them the rich ore of sterling and imperishable truth.

With these hopes we have welcomed the appearance of the two volumes, in which Mr. Pettigrew, librarian to His Royal Highness, has begun his Catalogue of the important collection which he superintends. We could have wished, for the reasons on which we have sufficiently enlarged, that they had come before us in a somewhat more generally accessible form; and

VOL. XXXIX. *Cl. Jl.* NO. LXXVIII. U

we have to regret the high price of the work, inasmuch as it owes its costliness, in a great measure, to decorations that are devoid of interest. From this censure we except the portrait of H. R. H. Duke of Sussex, which most appropriately supplies the place of a frontispiece to the first volume; also the beautiful engraving of a very striking illumination in a Book of Offices of the fifteenth century. Some curious illustrations of the manners of the same age are afforded too by the illuminations copied from the Italian manuscript history of the Old Testament; but as to the other transcripts of illuminated pages, and fac-similes of colophons, Aldine letters, and Rodt and Richel's capitals, we must confess that we

do lack some part
Of that quick spirit that is in Antony :

we take no delight in the grinning deformities and labyrinthine circumlineations, by which the monkish penmen and their imitators, the first printers, so complacently displayed their exquisite taste for the grotesque, the intricate, and the absurd; to our minds they are surpassed even by the "shapeless sculpture" of a village tombstone; but they must certainly yield the palm to that *beau-ideal* of academic comeliness, which we have seen in an early catalogue of the Bodleian library—the fat plethoric cherub, who, while weaving a grateful true-love knot between the venerable effigies of Nicholas and Dorothy Wadham, reposes his own easy and unencumbered obesity on the downy softness of a pulpit-cushion.

In the catalogue of the *printed* books, Mr. Pettigrew has wisely abstained from enlarging on the bibliographical merits of superb bindings, broad margins, rough leaves, uncut copies, &c., which he justly considered as "beneath the subject;" it would surely have been more consistent with this dignified feeling, more worthy of the library, and more honorable to the librarian, if in his account of the *written* books some of these uninteresting minutiae had been altogether omitted.

We have noticed these imperfections, not as defects but as redundancies; they are certainly of inferior consequence compared with more general merits. With these drawbacks, however, we acknowledge the full value of Mr. Pettigrew's labors: the plan which he has marked out is clear and judicious; and as far as he has gone, the style in which he has executed it bears the joint impress of ability and industry. The library which he has undertaken to describe, consists, as he informs us in his preface, "of upwards of fifty thousand volumes of Mss. and printed

books." Of these twelve thousand are theological; and the portion of the Catalogue now published, although extending to 810 pages, contains only the first portion of this department. In all similar digests, custom has assigned precedence to theology; and the Scriptures are of course placed at the head of that class. The two volumes before us are therefore chiefly occupied with different editions of the Sacred Writings, either in the original Hebrew and Greek, or in a great variety of ancient and modern versions. In the first, the Mss. belonging to this division are exhibited in the following order:

- 51 Hebrew, including three specimens of Tephilin, called Phylacteries.
- 12 Greek.
- 148 Latin.
- 34 French.
- 11 Italian and Spanish.
- 9 German and Dutch.
- 15 English and Irish.
- 18 Arabic, Persian, Armenian, Pali, Singhalese, and Burman.

The contents of the second part are shown in the following summary:

- 28 Polyglotts.
- 101 Hebrew Bibles, or portions of the Old Testament.
- 39 Greek do.
- 224 Latin do.

The Mss. are not exclusively confined to the Scriptures, but embrace generally all subjects connected with theology: there are amongst them commentaries and sermons, missals and prayers, golden legends, rules of monastic orders, polemical tracts, and other early samples of the fruit, which the same vineyard still continues to produce. Succinct biographical notices of the principal authors and editors, with brief accounts of their opinions and writings, are interspersed in both volumes: being taken from well-known sources, they present in themselves no novelty; but they are an agreeable relief to a dull enumeration of titles; and, while to some they will afford information, they may frequently save to others the trouble of referring to the original authorities. It is evident that a work of this nature supplies very scanty materials for critical observations. The cursory glances which we are permitted to take at the contents of some of the Mss., might indeed furnish themes for various dissertations; but we shall content ourselves with pointing out some of the most striking articles in this valuable collection, adding such occasional remarks as the subjects may appear to require.

Mr. Pettigrew has prefaced his account of the Hebrew Mss. by a short introduction; which, although somewhat too exclusively bibliographical, will nevertheless be read with interest. A growing attention to Hebrew is one of the marked features in the spirit of inquiry which distinguishes the present age. The unquestionable antiquity of that language—its radical connexion with the various Celtic dialects, once so widely prevalent in Europe, and still preserved in the mountainous districts of Britain and Ireland—the key which it affords to the earliest records of the human race—the original pictures which it presents of pastoral and patriarchal customs—the peculiar habits and remarkable fate of the people whose history it discloses—these circumstances all attach a more than common importance to the study of Hebrew; and when to these we add, that it is our only guide to a correct knowledge of the fundamental principles of Christianity, we have said enough to justify our astonishment at the long neglect to which it has been condemned. It has never been considered as indispensable to the proper education of our religious teachers; and when acquired, it has seldom been otherwise than wasted in cavils, as idle as the most ridiculous vanities of Rabbinical mysticism. The strong prejudices early imbibed against the Jewish nation, and the antipathy which it was deemed a religious obligation to inculcate against them, seem to have been extended in an equal degree even to their language; and hence it may have been (if indeed the fact itself is true) that the original records of Christianity entirely perished, as soon as they were translated out of that language for the use of the Gentile converts. There may be at first some difficulty in removing the obstructions, that have been raised by Cabalists and Masorites on the one hand, and by seekers of signs and expounders of prophecies on the other; but much may be done by the help of a little common sense, exercised with patience and moderation.

The example of the Duke of Sussex has already produced the good effect of directing the public attention to this branch of learning; but we are more deeply indebted to His Royal Highness for having taught us to cultivate it without pedantry or fanaticism—not as an exotic wonder, the rarely blowing show-plant of a privileged conservatory—but as the native growth of the common field of reason, thriving under every sky, where the blighting mildews of bigotry have ceased to fall.

The large proportion of Hebrew works contained in the Catalogue, would alone prove the importance which the Duke of Sussex attaches to this study; and many of them are curious

and highly valuable documents, worthy of a place in the first theological library of which this kingdom can boast. No. 1. of the Rolled Mss. is stated to be "probably the most ancient and most perfect Ms. of the Pentateuch in this country;" and No. 3. of the Square Mss. is described as "unquestionably one of the most splendid Hebrew Mss. ever executed."

Of its splendor some idea may be formed from the fine plates in which some of the most striking illuminations are depicted; but its highest and most permanent recommendation will be found in the fact, that "the accuracy of the Ms. is equal to the beauty of the execution."

The Sepher Dusheino (Square Mss., No. 6.) is a rabbinical commentary on the Pentateuch by Samuel, commonly called Dusheino. Mr. Pettigrew has extracted a passage from this work, which we will quote, as a specimen of cabalistic subtlety. The first chapter of Genesis commences with the word בְּרֵאשִׁית *bereshith* (In the beginning); ב, *be*, answering to our preposition, *in*. ב, *beth*, is the second letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and is used also to denote the number *two*. On these facts the learned Rabbi has given us the following comment:

All the letters, being 22 in number, rose and presented themselves in the presence of the Holy God (blessed be He), each of them soliciting to be placed at the beginning of the Law. They were all refused but the ב, which was chosen to show that the Lord had created two worlds—this world and a future state; that the wicked shall not say, "I have prospered in this world; what have I to fear?" but shall reflect that there is another world, where he must account for his conduct; and the righteous shall not say, "All the good I have done in this world I have lost;" but shall trust that there is a second world, where he shall receive his reward.

The next Ms. is another commentary on the Pentateuch, written in the fifteenth century; the extracts from which prove, that the Jews, together with the other peculiarities which through so many ages have kept them a distinct people in every part of the globe, have also preserved that remarkable style of writing which has so often been noticed in their canonical books. As an instance of this we quote the following passage, which closes the notes on Deuteronomy:

The Law was finished with gladness and rejoicing; praises to God, who was before any thing, who created the luminaries, sun and moon, and they declare his righteousness with every praise, thanksgiving and song. He in his mercies shall help us. From every remote course shall he gather our captivities to the house of his glory, for the sake of the piety of him who despised every image and likeness; and for the piety of him, who was bound to his Creator as a ram of the first year; and for the piety of him who dwelt in tents with rejoicing and gladness:

for the sake of these three may He look down on us with the multitude of his compassions and mercies with favor, and shelter us under the wings of his mercy as a shield and buckler, for He possesses heavens and earth. He is the God prior to any thing. May these the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in thy presence, Jehovah, my rock and redeemer. Amen. So may thy will be.

No. 30 is the *Moreh Nevochim*, or *Instructor of the Perplexed*, by Moses Maimonides. If the date of the twelfth century, which is assigned to this Ms., be correct, it must be one of the oldest and most authentic copies now in existence, having been made during the life of the author, who died in 1208. The original work was written in Arabic about the year 1184; and translated into Hebrew by Samuel Aben Tybbon, the friend and correspondent of Maimonides. It has been justly described, as "one of the most rational that ever proceeded from the pen of a rabbi:" it rescues the Mosaic religion from the absurd and distorting mysticism of the Talmud, and explains how all its institutions were adapted to the natural, political and moral condition of the Jewish people. When it first appeared, it shared the common fate of all books, which endeavor to apply the test of reason to the fables of superstition: ignorant fanatics, stirred up by an interested priesthood, condemned its doctrines as heretical, impious, and blasphemous; while its admirers were equally vehement in their praises. Fortunately for the author, he was secured from the rancor of his enemies by the protection of a Mahometan prince, the liberal Saladin, at whose court he filled the honorable post of physician, unmolested either for his attachment to the religion of his fathers, or for his intelligent exposition of its tenets.¹ Maimonides died in peace at the advanced age of 70 years; and after his death the hostile sect enjoyed the satisfaction of recording on his tomb the ineffectual sentence of excommunication which they had fulminated against him and his disciples. This epitaph, disgraceful only to those by whom it had been inscribed, was at length erased through the intervention of the celebrated rabbi, David Kimchi; and the name of Maimonides has since been univer-

¹ In the biographical memoir of Maimonides, Mr. Pettigrew has inadvertently followed a very faulty translation of the letter to Tybbon, in which the writer is made to say to his friend—"I live in Egypt, the king in Alkaira, which places lie two sabbath-days' journey asunder." (Part II. p. 150.) This passage should have been rendered—"I live in Egypt, at the distance of nearly two sabbath-days' journey from Cairo, where the king resides." A sabbath-day's journey is well known to have been seven furlongs and a half.

sally held in the highest veneration by the descendants of those who reviled and persecuted him.

The Catalogue of Hebrew Mss. concludes with an account of the three תפילין (*Tephilin*), or prayer-signs of the Jews, to which the term phylacteries has been so long and so strangely misapplied. Of the notions which generally prevail on this subject, Mr. Pettigrew has given a learned summary; from many parts of which we altogether dissent. He has stated correctly enough the opinions of others, but it is to the nature of those opinions themselves that we object.

"The word phylactery," he observes, "derived from the Greek φυλακτήριον, properly signifies a *preservative*; and in this sense has been used by various nations to protect them against evil spirits, diseases, dangers, &c. In many parts of the East, these superstitious practices still obtain. The phylacteries of the Jews are of *three* kinds; of each of which there is a specimen in His Royal Highness's Library. They consist of portions of Scripture taken from the Pentateuch, selected according to the situation for which they are destined, written on very fine vellum, in a very small square character, and with a particular kind of ink. They are used for the *head*, for the *arm*, and are also attached to the *door-posts*."—Part i. p. xxxvi.

After describing the manner of preparing the *Tephilin*, Mr. Pettigrew proceeds to state, on the authority of Dr. Adam Clarke, that they were worn by the Jews for *three* different purposes:

1. *As signs or remembrancers.*
2. *To procure reverence and respect in the sight of the heathen.*
3. *They used them as amulets or charms to drive away evil spirits.*

For the last assertion here made, we do not believe that there is any substantial ground whatever, nor can we on this point bow even to the respectable authority on which it is advanced. We do not maintain that the Jews had no faith in talismans; but that the strong characteristic trait of all their superstitions, and even of the grossest corruptions sanctioned by their Talmud, is such a religious veneration for the Torah, as can never have allowed them to prostitute any of its passages to purposes of magic; and this they must have done, if they had ever used their *Tephilin*, as "amulets, charms, or preservatives against diseases, dangers, &c." Such a charge is undoubtedly countenanced by the designation of *phylacteries*, which has been

¹ The labels affixed to the door-posts, and with which, according to Maimonides, every door in a dwelling-house ought to be provided, are termed Mezuzah, from מזוזת (Mezuzoth), the word used in Deuteronomy (vi. 9.) to signify door-posts.

almost universally given to them in other languages;¹ and we are surprised that the Jews have never protested against so obvious and unjust a mistranslation. The facility with which they have not only admitted but actually used the expression, (see D. Levi's *Ceremonies of the Jews*, p. 185.) can only be accounted for by the indifference which even the most learned among them have constantly evinced for any thing like a critical understanding of heathen tongues. *Phylacteries*, or *guards*, was the term applied by the Greeks to the amulets or charms used by the Indians, Persians, and Babylonians. St. Jerome distinctly admits this (*Opera*, tom. iii. p. 696.) in his commentary on the passage, in which the Greek translator of St. Matthew's Gospel first employed the word to describe the *Tephilin* of the Jews. St. Augustin, also, not only calls them diabolical (*diabolica phylacteria*), but he repeatedly classes them with auguries, incantations, casting of lots, divinations, and other works of the devil. (*Op.* tom. iii. p. 957. 1070.) Not to multiply authorities on this point, we will only add that of Duncange, who in his Glossary says, "*Phylacteria appellabant veteres amuleta ad arcendos vel pellendos morbos.*" (*Ad voc. Phylacteria.*)

There can be no doubt as to the general acceptance of the term in this sense, which differs so widely from the meaning of *Tephilin*, that the translator in confounding them, must have acted either inadvertently, ignorantly, or maliciously. In either case it is our duty to repair and not to aggravate his error. The Hebrew word simply denotes something appertaining to prayer—a prayer-sign—an incitement, preparative, or help to devotion; and it is well known that the Jews of the present day still continue to use the *Tephilin* for this, and for no other purpose. Buxtorf (*Synagoga Judaica*, p. 135.) calls them "*Precatoria, id est, lora ad precum memoriam animos revocantia;*" and Lightfoot, who is by no means consistent in the various accounts which he gives of them in different parts of his writings, still, in the only passage in which he points out the pre-

¹ Luther, indeed, drawing on the copious stores of German, with that bold independence of foreign idiom for which the writers of his country are distinguished, rendered this term, in his translation of the Scriptures, by *Denkzettel*:—*Die machen ihre Denkzettel breit*—(*Matt.* xxiii. 5.): the literal meaning of which is, *thought-tickets*, i. e. remembrancers, or notes used for the purpose of calling to mind what we wish to remember. This, although it does not express with strict accuracy the original Hebrew idea, still shows something of decent regard for the object to which it was directed.

cise meaning of the expression, says, that it signified “*memorandums of their observance of the law, and evidences of their devotion; and therefore they were called in the Greek tongue Phylacteries, or Observatories, and in the Hebrew, Tephillin, or Oraisons.*” (Lightfoot’s Works, vol. ii. p. 944.) St. Jerome, who alone among the Fathers of the Church has any pretensions to credit as a linguist, condemns the superstitious use of phylacteries by the Christians and the nations of the East; but in reference to the Jews, he takes a widely different view of the custom; and without any allusion to magical influence, considers the practice to have been observed amongst them only for the purpose of keeping the law for ever before their eyes, as a constant guard and monitor of their actions. (Hieronymi Op. tom. iii. p. 696.) But the earliest and most decisive authority on this subject is that of Josephus, who, if he did not write originally in Greek, was familiarly acquainted with that language, and translated his own works into it: he refers very distinctly to the custom which prevailed among his countrymen, of carrying the precepts of their venerated lawgiver on their heads and arms, and of inscribing them on their door-posts; but he never employs the word *φυλακτήρια* to describe these labels; and he states in the clearest terms, that they were only used for the purpose of diffusing a general knowledge of the duties prescribed by the law, and of keeping alive a constant feeling of gratitude for the divine favor and protection, especially as manifested towards their nation.¹ Philo Judæus also clearly alludes to this practice, and to the effects produced by it; when, speaking of the reverence which the Jews entertained for their code of laws, he says, that, “regarding them as divine oracles, they were instructed in them from their earliest youth, and *carried the*

¹ As we do not recollect to have seen this passage ever referred to by any of the numerous writers who have attended to this subject, we subjoin the following extracts from an early Greek edition: Καλὸν γὰρ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐγγραφεύτας αὐτοῖς καὶ τῇ μνήμῃ φυλαχθῆναι, μηδέποτε ἐξαλειφθῆναι δυναμένους. οὕτως γὰρ καὶ οὐδὲ ἀμαρτήσονται μὴ δυνάμενοι λέγειν ἄγνοιαν τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις διωρισμένων. οἱ τε νόμοι πολλὴν πρὸς ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐξουσι παρῆρσιν, ὡς προλεγόντων αὐτοῖς ἃ πείσονται καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐγγραφόντων διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἃ κελεύουσιν.—Δις δὲ ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ἀρχομένης τε τῆς αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁπότε πρὸς ὕπνον ὦρα ἐξεπέσθαι, μαρτυρεῖν τῷ Θεῷ τὰς δωρεὰς ἃς ἀπαλλαγείσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτίου γῆς παρέσχε, δικαίας οὐσης φύσει τῆς εὐχαριστίας, καὶ γενομένης ἐκ ἀμοιβῆς μὲν τῶν ἡδὴ γεγονότων, ἐπὶ δὲ προτροπῇ τῶν ἐσομένων. ἐπιγράφειν δὲ καὶ τοῖς θυράμασιν αὐτῶν τὰ μέγιστα ὧν εὐηργέτησεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς, ἕν τε βραχίονιν ἕκαστον διαφάινειν. ὅσα τε τὴν ἰσχὺν ἀποσημαίνειν δύναται τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοῖς εὐνοίαν φέρειν ἐγγεγραμμένα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς καὶ τοῦ βραχίονος, ὡς περίβλεπτον πανταχόθεν τὸ περὶ αὐτοῖς πρόθυμον τοῦ Θεοῦ.—Josephi Ant. Jud. lib. iv. c. 8. fol. Genév. 1634.

images of their precepts as pictures in their souls (ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἀγαλματοφοροῦσι τὰς τῶν διατεταγμένων εἰκόνας), so that by constantly looking on them their admiration might be the more excited."¹—(Philonis Liber de Legatione ad Caium, Op. p. 1022.)

Against these authorities, the only alleged proofs of the Tephilin having been used as amulets or charms, are adduced from the obscure and metaphorical language of the Targums and Talmud. Dr. Adam Clarke, as cited by Mr. Pettigrew, quotes in support of this opinion the following extract from the Targum on Canticles viii. 3:

The congregation of Israel hath said, I am elect above all people, because I bind my phylacteries on my left hand and on my head; and the scroll is fixed to the right side of my gate, the third part of which looks to my bed-chamber, *that demons may not be permitted to injure me.*

To this might have been added a much stronger clause in the Jerusalem Talmud, as given by Lightfoot, (vol. i. p. 256.) where it is declared that "*a man hath need to say over his phylacteries (Tephilin) every evening in his house to fright away evil spirits.*" There can be no doubt that the Jews, by the terms demons and evil spirits, understood as well the criminal inclinations and passions of the heart, as bodily diseases and accidental dangers; and taken in this sense, their prayer-signs, by continually calling up within them pure and holy thoughts, were unquestionably guards or preservatives against the domination of evil spirits. The figurative expressions to which we have just referred, can have no other meaning than this: for it is evident that the scroll fixed to the side of the gate and looking to the bed-chamber, could only be designed to remind them of those devotional exercises, by which Josephus informs us that they were accustomed to begin and close the day. The duty of early morning prayers, to be said by every individual at the first dawn of light, was particularly enjoined on them;² and

¹ If any doubt can be felt as to the allusion here made to visible portions of the law continually before the eyes of the Jews, it must be removed by the following declaration of the same writer in another part of his works, that all wisdom and philosophy originate entirely in the sense of sight. Δῆλόν ἐστιν, he says, ὅτι σοφία καὶ φιλοσοφία τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς ἔλαβον ἑτέρου τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, ἢ τῆς ἡγεμονίδος τῶν αἰσθήσεων ὁράσεων. —Philonis Liber de Abrahamo, Op. p. 373.

² "Præstantissimum ergo et longe præcellentissimum opus censerī debet, si quis summo mane, antequam illucescat, surrexerit, et noctem diei, sacro psalmodum cantu et precibus, conjunxerit."—Buxtorf. Synagoga Judaica, p. 116.

it is as disingenuous to infer that the sentences of the law which kept it in their remembrance were so used for talismanic or magical purposes, as it would be to attribute the same character to the texts of Scripture, which occupy conspicuous places in so many modern churches and courts of justice. These are our phylacteries; but we should be very indignant if we were accused of employing them as "amulets or charms to drive away evil spirits," because we intend them as guards against the demons of pride, malice, and impiety, or as preservatives from the dangers of false swearing and unjust verdicts. The only error which can fairly be imputed to the Jews on the score of their Tephilin, is that which was laid to their charge by the Caraites, of instituting a religious observance on a too strict interpretation of the figures of speech used in their sacred books.

I am very far from thinking, that the translator of St. Matthew's Gospel, by turning Tephilin into the Greek *φυλακτήρια*, gave the first proof of that hatred, which has subsequently been carried to such fearful extremes between Christians and Jews; but I am convinced that his incorrect version of the term has ministered to that hatred by countenancing the invidious charge brought against the latter, of having perverted a mere ceremonial of worship to the purposes of an occult and forbidden craft. I am therefore anxious to remove the ground for that accusation, hoping thereby to allay the fervor of those religious differences, which have so long marred the peace of the world; and I have the more readily volunteered my services on this occasion, because although I am satisfied that it has been done inadvertently, still the charge, which I have endeavored to repel, is here brought forward in so close a connexion with the name of the Duke of Sussex, that it has the appearance of placing the cause of expiring prejudice under the sanction of the most liberal and enlightened prince of the present times.

The Greek Mss. are neither numerous, nor of a very early date: the most remarkable among them is No. 2, "*Novum Testamentum Græcum. Ms. in Memb. Sæc. XIII. octavo:*" it contains neither the disputed passage in the fifth chapter of St. John's first Epistle, nor the Apocalypse. Mr. Pettigrew very justly observes, that "it would be very desirable in any future edition of the New Testament that so valuable a Ms. should be collated."

The extensive catalogue of Latin Mss. begins with thirty copies either of the intire Bible, or of portions of Holy Writ;

the dates of which are generally from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. No. 25, *Psalterium Latinum*, is, however, of higher antiquity, and is certainly not of later origin than the tenth century. Many of these are richly illuminated, and have furnished Mr. Pettigrew with materials of florid description. These are followed by eighty-eight miscellaneous theological treatises; some of which are curious as Mss. on the score of antiquity, and others on account of their rarity, although their contents are generally known to the world, either in the writings of the Fathers, or in those of later controversialists. But there is one among them to which a more particular and melancholy interest attaches; this is No. 101, "*Serveti (Mic.) Christianismi Restitutio*:" of which none can read without painful and indignant feelings the following account, written on a fly-leaf of the present Ms. by M. Meerman, from whose collection it passed into the Library of the Duke of Sussex:

Hæc est copia Msta. libri longe rarissimi, cujus auctor famosus ille Michael Servetus, quique impressus fuit Viennæ Allobrogum, 1553. in octavo, et *femori auctoris alligatus cum ipso combustus est*. Ejus autem tanta est raritas, ut qui gloriari possit, se illum typis excusum vidisse, nemo reperiatur. Nam quod Cassellis in bibliotheca Principis Hessiæ olim exstitit exemplar, (ex quo pauca manu descripta promanarunt) deperditum est. Vid. Jo. Vogt in Catal. Libr. rarior. pag. 624. (edit. 1747.) Hocce vero exemplar perquam diligenter et accurate ex impresso transcriptum est, et quidem ita, ut singulæ paginæ hic responderent paginis voluminis impressi.

I have always regarded the fate of Servetus as peculiarly severe and pitiable. If he had suffered, like other Protestant martyrs, at the mandate of the blood-deluged Vatican, his case would scarcely have been distinguished amongst the hecatombs of victims that have been sacrificed to the perversion of the Gospel of peace. But to fall by the hand of a brother-reformer—to be betrayed amidst the security of that confidence which he unsuspectingly placed in a fellow-champion of religious liberty—to have the frank and unguarded communications of a private correspondence brought forward as evidence in order to obtain his condemnation: these circumstances embittered even the horrid tortures which he underwent; and while they associate with the memory of Servetus claims to universal sympathy, they have stamped on the name of Calvin a burning stigma of everlasting infamy. The passions that may be urged, not in defence, but in palliation of the papal atrocities committed at that period, will not apply to the savage, unmitigated cruelty of the Genevan bigot. The crimes of the Roman hier-

archy were the vindictive policy of established power, trembling on the verge of ruin. They were not the necessary results of that form of ecclesiastical discipline, or of that system of theological faith, under the sanction of which they were practised; they were the foul deeds of men, beset by the common infirmities of their nature, acting under the excitement of strong passions, and agitated by the convulsive events of a new and strange conjuncture. The Reformation was the first effort of a mighty principle, then starting into existence; an influence before unfelt in the direction of human affairs was then beginning to develop itself; the public mind was awakened, and in the early consciousness of its capacities and its rights, was fearlessly challenging the presiding authorities that had usurped its place, and arrogated to themselves the undisputed government of the world. The ruling powers, presuming on the stupid ignorance so long displayed by the great mass of the people, and trusting to an ascendancy founded on inveterate habits of superstitious and implicit submission, adopted the bold and wicked policy of desperate men. Tenaciously clinging to every prerogative which they were called on to surrender—maintaining vigorously every post in which they were attacked by the growing intellect of the age—they scrupled not to employ all the most violent means of defence that came within their reach, for the purpose of striking terror into the bosoms of their assailants. This merciless and inhuman ferocity marked all the measures of the priesthood at that time, and made the expiring efforts of their fury more generally fatal to those against whom they were directed, than the indulgence of uncontrolled dominion had ever proved in the days of their highest prosperity. Through long ages of unalarmed security, fasting and penance and humiliation had been deemed satisfactory atonements for those offences, against which, in the hour of danger, they unsparingly and unfeelingly pronounced the doom of death—of death too in its sternest, most horrid, most appalling form. It was not the priest, the sectarian, the religionist, pursuing with relentless and unmitigated severity, the dissident from received doctrines and the preacher of unknown creeds;—it was the jealous, vindictive, furious tyrant, aroused from fancied security by unexpected opposition, and going forth in all the pride of long exerted sway and in all the complacency of assumed right, to crush, to trample on, to annihilate, if possible, the daring but despised intruder.

This was not the situation of Calvin; nor can even this faint apology be advanced in extenuation of his conduct. It was no common weakness of human nature, under the influence of

which he acted: he was not taken by surprise in the sudden emergency of an unforeseen and critical conjuncture. He had been trained up in no habits of unresisted and absolute command—he had no endowed communities, no lucrative system of established government to defend—he had no attack to fear, no dangers to apprehend, from the lonely, wayfaring exile, who came as a guest and stranger within his gates, escaping from the persecutions of their common enemy, and passing onward to a more distant and secure asylum. The only impulse by which he was driven to the base and bloody deed, was that of sheer fanaticism—the unchecked power of an austere and exclusive creed over a narrow, dark, and self-sufficient mind. Yet the followers of this man deem themselves justified at the present day in opposing the repeal of statutes which withhold civil rights from their Catholic fellow-subjects, on the ground of the barbarities practised against the early reformers. Let them look to the conduct of their own great heresiarch, and then say if it would be just that his transgressions should be visited on them by the infliction of similar degrading penalties. Let them remember, that although human passion will sometimes invest itself with the sacred dignity of religion, yet it is not difficult to tear off the assumed disguise, and expose the unveiled monster in all its naked and odious deformity. The course of events may engender in the bosom of any church the dark and deadly sins of ambition, avarice, revenge, and cruelty—the lust of power and the thirst for blood; but let not the vices of the man be identified with and regarded as essentially characteristic of the opinions which he professes; let not the crimes which temporary causes may have produced, however deep their dye, affix an indelible stain on the unoffending posterity of the perpetrators. Reprobate the guilty as they deserve—bear everlastingly in mind the memory of their iniquities—make the record of their violence and the lesson of their fall, an impressive warning to those who may in after-times be invested with the like authority and exposed to the same temptations. But, be just to the innocent, nor visit on them the consequence of proceedings in which they can have had no participation; and the spirit of which, equally with ourselves, they condemn, execrate, and abjure.

The history of Servetus's work, *Christianismi Restitutio*, is scarcely less remarkable than that of the unfortunate author himself. Previously to the sad catastrophe at Geneva, he had been condemned to the same fate at Vienne in Dauphiny; but having effected his escape, he was burnt in effigy, and five

bates of his books supplied the fuel for that *auto da fe*, which might have been termed ludicrous, had it not been followed by so fatal a tragedy. All his writings that were not destroyed on that occasion were collected and thrown into the flames, in which he himself perished. One copy alone of the *Christianismi Restitutio* was secretly preserved by one of his judges, and afterwards deposited in the library of the Landgrave of Hesse at Cassel. From this a few Ms. copies were made, one of which is that now in the collection of His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex. The original came into the possession of the celebrated Dr. Mead, who in the year 1723 was preparing to publish a quarto edition of it; but before the work was completed, it was seized and burnt by desire of Dr. Gibson, Bishop of London: on this occasion four copies are said to have escaped, one of which is in the library of the Medical Society of London, and contains the whole of that part in which the first idea of the circulation of the blood was recorded. In the addenda to the first part of his Catalogue, Mr. Pettigrew has inserted a letter from Dr. Sigmond, which is conclusive as to the fact that Dr. Mead's original copy is now in the Bibliothèque Royale at Paris: and thus after the successive attempts made to destroy the book, by Catholics at Vienne, by Calvinists at Geneva, and by a bishop of the Anglican Church at London, the few volumes, which have by chance evaded the general interdict, are now become the bibliographical treasures of princely and royal libraries.

The following are the titles of the parts which compose this rare and interesting work:

1. De Trinitate Divina, quod in ea non sit invisibilium trium rerum illusio, sed vera substantia Dei, manifestatio in Verbo, et communicatio in Spiritu. Libri vii.
2. De Fide et Justitia Regni Christi, Legis justitiam superantis, et de Charitate. Libri iii.
3. De Regeneratione Superna et de Regno Anti-Christi. Libri iv.
4. Epistolæ xxx. ad Johannem Calvinum, Gebennensium Concionatorem.
5. Signa lx. Regni Anti-Christi, et revelatio ejus jam nunc præsens.
6. De Mysterio Trinitatis, et Veterum Disciplina, ad Philippum Melancthonem, et ejus Collegas, Apologia.¹

¹ M. De Angélis, the writer of the life of Servetus in the *Biographie Universelle*, (töm. xlii. p. 122.) states, that two copies of the original edition of this work were preserved; one of which is in the Imperial Library at Vienna, and the other in the Bibliothèque Royale at Paris. The latter, he adds, is that which was stolen from Cassel, and purchased for the Duke de la Vallière at Gaignet's sale, where it obtained 3810 fr. although in bad condition. Dr. Sigmond's letter, by showing this to

The Latin Mss. conclude with thirty missals, breviaries, books of offices, and statutes of religious orders: for ample accounts of which we must refer those who are curious in such matters to the information respecting them, afforded by Mr. Pettigrew's work. As a specimen of their contents, we give the following singular prayer to the Virgin, in old French, extracted from No. 129. *Horæ Beatæ Virginis Mariæ, cum aliis Officiis Ecclesiæ Romanæ. Ms. in Memb. Sæc. xv.*

Doulce dame de misericorde, mere de pitie, fontaine de tous biens, qui portastes nostre Seigneur Jhesu Crist neuf mois en vos precieux flans, et la lai tatez de vos doulces mamelles. Belle tres doulce dame, je vous cry mercy, et vous pri que vous vueilliez prier vostre benoit filz qu'il ait pitié et mercy de moy. Et ainsi vous le priez belle très doulce dame, et je magenoilleray quinze fois devant vostre benoit ymage, en l'onneur des quinze joies que vous eustez de vostre chier filz en terre.

We are not disposed to ridicule or to quarrel with those whose devotional feelings can vent themselves in such effusions; we only ask them not to burn, anathematize, excommunicate or persecute us, if we cannot join with them; and we are quite sure that the best way of teaching the intolerant to be forbearing and moderate, is to show in our conduct to them what we wish them to become to others.

Among the Mss. in modern languages, the following are the most remarkable:

French, No. 3.—*La Légende Dorée, ou La Vie des Saints. Ms. sur Vélîn du xv^e siècle. Fol. 2 tom.*

Italian, No. 1.—*Historia del vecchio Testamento. Ms. supra Pergamena. Sæc. xv. Fol.*

English, No. 1.—*Sandys (George) Paraphrase on Job. Ms. on paper. Sæc. xvii. Fol.*

have been Dr. Mead's copy, supplies another link to the chain of the history of this remarkable book. In the same article it is said that Servetus borrowed the idea of the circulation of the blood from Nemesius, a Christian writer of the fourth century, whose work *De Natura Hominis* was reprinted by Valla, at Lyons, in 1538, at which time Servetus was living there, and corrected the press. He had, however, at least the merit of improving a hint, which had slumbered during 1200 years. But the whole of the article referred to casts a shade over his merits, and places his failings in the boldest relief, for the evident purpose of softening the general detestation in which Calvin's proceeding is held, and thus justifying indirectly the numerous murders perpetrated by the Romish Church. The advocates of persecution may heap authority on authority, till they imagine that they have scaled the heavens; their doctrines will always remain equally barbarous and hateful, whether in the form of papal decrees *de hæretico comburendo*, or in that of Calvin's self-condemning sophistry, *jure gladii coercendos esse hæreticos*.

From this work Mr. Pettigrew has given three extracts; and as it is now very scarce, we quote the following passage to show the general style and merits of the composition:

Ah! few and full of sorrow are the dayes
Of man from woman sprung: his life decayes,
Like that frail flower, which with the sunnes uprise
Her bud unfolds, and with the evening dies.
He like an emptie shadow glides away:
And all his life is but a winter's day.
Wilt thou thine eye upon a vapour bend?
Or with so weake an opposite contend?
Who can a pure and christall current bring
From such a muddy and polluted spring?
Oh! since his dayes are numbred: since thou hast
Prescribed him bounds that are not to be past:
A little with his punishment dispence,
Till he have served his time and part from hence.
A tree, though hewne with axes to the ground,
Renews his growth and springs from his greene wound:
Although his root wax old, his fibers dry;
Although the saplesse bole begin to dye;
Yet will at sent of water freshly sprout:
And like a plant thrust his young branches out.
But man, when once cut downe; when his pale ghost
Fleets into aire; he is for ever lost.
As meteors vanish, which the seas exhale;
As torrents in the drouth of summer faile:
So perisht man from death shall never rise:
But sleepe in silent shades with sealed up eyes:
While the celestiaall orbes in order roule,
And turne their flames about the stedfast Pole.

Among the Arabic Mss., the copy of the Koran, No. 2, is worthy of notice, as having belonged to Tippoo Sultan, in whose library it was found by the conquerors of Seringapatam, and whose spectacles were discovered between its leaves, as if the perusal of it had been one of the latest acts of his life. It was presented to the Duke of Sussex by Major-general Ogg, who obtained it on the spot, at the public sale of the treasures captured by the British army. The Armenian version of the four Gospels is a curious and valuable document; it bears the date of the 13th century; and being therefore more ancient than the Ms. from which the first printed edition was copied, it is worthy of being carefully studied by those who are engaged in critically investigating the history of the earliest Christian records. The contents of the Mss. in the Pali and Burman languages are unknown: we can at present therefore only look at them either as honorable proofs of the industry so success-

fully exerted in bringing together this splendid collection, or as testimonies of the well-deserved homage paid by men of talent and of learning to the high literary reputation of the Duke of Sussex.

The second part contains a catalogue of no less than 392 different printed copies of the Scriptures, in the four classes alone of Polyglotts, and Hebrew, Greek and Latin Bibles. If from this numerous list we were to begin to select subjects for particular notice, we might extend this article into a volume as ample as that which is now under our observation. We shall therefore content ourselves with a brief general view of the nature of the collection itself, and of the manner in which Mr. Pettigrew has performed his part of the task. We have unquestionably here presented to us as complete a library as can possibly be formed in this department of literature. Scarcely a single edition of any note is wanting; and the whole comprises a mass of information of the highest order, and of incalculable value to the biblical student. Among the Polyglotts are,

The Ximenes, or Complutensian. 1514-17.

The Antwerp. 1569-72.¹

The Paris, or Le Jay's. 1645.

The London, or Bryan Walton's. 1657.

A very rare and valuable copy of the Pentateuch in Hebrew, Chaldee, Persian, and Arabic, printed at Constantinople in 1546.

Bagster's Polyglott, 1817. This is a presentation copy from the Bishop of Norwich.

We notice this circumstance in order to have an opportunity of giving greater publicity to the following inscription, and to the testimony which the most benevolent prelate of modern times therein bears to the excellence of religious liberality and the character of the Duke of Sussex, to whom it is addressed in these terms:

Altissimo Augusto Frederico,
Georgii Tertii, Britanniarum Regis, Filio,
Duci de Sussex, &c. &c. &c.
Principi nostrorum temporum doctissimo;
Libertatis publicæ et Religionis veræ Amico;
Qui illustris avitæ stirpis splendorem

¹ Of this Polyglott, which, as Mr. Pettigrew observes, "is and must continue of great rarity," there is a very fine copy in the Norwich city library. It was a bequest to that institution in the year 1634, and is described in the will of the donor as "*a Spanish Bible of the value of twenty-five pounds.*"

Illustrioribus virtutis et doctrinæ radiis adauget;
Et qui in Hebraicis literis præcipue tantum profecit,
Ut perpauci sint veteris Testamenti Lectores,

A quibus

“Plenius ex ipso fonte bibuntur aquæ:”

Librum hunc sacrosanctum,
Observantiæ et Amoris pignus,
Humillime offert

Henricus, Episcopus Norvicensis.

The Hebrew Bibles are numerous, beginning with the second Bomberg edition in 1521, and concluding with D'Allemand's printed at London in 1822. No. 57, “*Biblia Hebraica Magna Rabbinica*,” published at Amsterdam, in 4 vols. folio, 1724-7, is “unquestionably the most copious and the most valuable of all the Rabbinical Bibles.” Among the portions of the Old Testament in Hebrew, the most remarkable are the *Prophetæ Posteriores et Priores*, with the commentary of D. Kimchi, to which Mr. Pettigrew has affixed the date of 1485.

The Greek Bibles, although fewer in number, contain two of leading interest: that of 1587, edited by Cardinal Caraffa, from the *Codex Vaticanus*; and that of 1824, copied by the Rev. H. Baber from the *Codex Alexandrinus* of the British Museum.

As Latin was the prevailing hierophantic dialect of the age, in which the art of printing was first introduced, all the earliest editions of the Scriptures are of course in that language. Of these the library of the Duke of Sussex presents an ample collection. The Latin Bibles amount to 224; amongst which are,

The first Vulgate, printed by Guttenberg. Mentz, 1450-55.

The first Basle. 1470-71.

The first Roman. 1471.

The first Coburger. Nuremberg, 1475.

The first Venice. 1475.

The first Paris. 1476.

The first Naples. 1476.

and all the most celebrated editions, which have appeared from that period up to the present time; “*sed nos genera degustamus, non bibliothecas excutimus.*”

We have already observed, that Mr. Pettigrew has discarded from this division of his work much of that minute bibliographical detail, which figured so conspicuously in the former part. The disposition to indulge in it has however occasionally betrayed itself; as, for instance, in the account given of the first Latin Bible at page 289, where we are informed that

the first volume has 324 leaves ; the second 317 ; being 641 to the whole work. In the first nine pages there are 40 lines in a column ; in the tenth 41 ; and in the remainder 42 lines. The columns, two in number on each page, are $11\frac{1}{2}$ inches in height ; $3\frac{1}{2}$ in breadth ; and there is a space of $\frac{1}{4}$ of an inch between them, &c.

This disposition had, however, previously broken out in a letter from Dr. Adam Clarke, page 12, announcing the discovery, "that certain parts of the Complutensian Polyglott have been reprinted." If this circumstance had been connected, as it is in Bryan Walton's work, with some great political change—if it had furnished another proof of submissiveness to the powers that be—if it had shown that Cardinal Ximenes had detected and expunged some latent heresy ; or if even any new readings had been introduced ;—we should have admitted that the labor bestowed in tracing this fact had not been thrown away.

By great industry Mr. Pettigrew has brought together much useful general information respecting the numerous editions that have been printed of the Jewish Scriptures, and the learned men of all countries who have had any share in preparing them. Next to the merit of having collected a good library, is that of letting the world know its contents by means of a complete and well-arranged catalogue. On any terms, therefore, we receive with gratitude the details which he offers us respecting the literary treasures of which he has the care ; and in pointing out what we deem errors, we have been actuated by no carping spirit of captious cavilling, but by an earnest desire to render the continuation of his undertaking more satisfactory to himself, more honorable to his patron, and more serviceable to mankind. From the sample afforded in this volume, we look forward with greater interest to what is yet to come. We cannot anticipate that the *Bibliotheca Sussexiana* will prove as rich in other subjects as it has already shown itself in theology ; but we feel assured, that whatever works it contains in those classes, they are not unworthy of the situation in which they are placed : and if the circumstances, on which Mr. Pettigrew has made the farther prosecution of his plan contingent, should hinge on the public interest taken in his labors, we trust he will have reason to know, that by completing his task he will satisfy the highly-raised expectations of the literary world. It is of course to the department of ancient history that we principally look for the

means of promoting the objects touched on in our introductory remarks; but we have already observed that for the present we expect more from the impulse given to inquiry in that direction, than from any immediate information that may be supplied. To the force of that impulse the publication of this catalogue must powerfully contribute, and on that account alone we should be anxious for the early appearance of the remaining parts. The field of history is daily enlarging, and each succeeding hour removes us to a greater distance from the transactions of the past. As that distance increases, the remoter points are continually escaping from the range of our perception; and it becomes more and more difficult to retain that knowledge of them, which has ever been found essential to the due improvement of the present. Even in the days of Quintilian, this study demanded the full vigor of mature and active intellect; and the lapse of ages has confirmed the truth of his maxim, that "non expectanda est ultima ætas, cum studia præsent, ut quantum ad cognitionem pertinet rerum, etiam præteritis sæculis vixisse videamur."

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

IN that very characteristic part of the "Nubes" of Aristophanes, where Strepsiades, in a rather long colloquy with his son Phidippides, instructs him, ludicrously enough, as to the propriety of calling ἀλεκτρυάϊνα and ἀλέκτωρ what he had indifferently denominated ἀλεκτροῦν, — the latter inquires of him, if such were the nature of the learned lessons he had been taught by frequenting the schools of the sophists? to which Strepsiades replies;

Στ. χ' ἄτερὰ γε πόλλ'. ἀλλ' ὅ τι μάθοιμ' ἐκάστοτε,
ἐπελανθανόμην ἂν εὐθὺς ὑπὸ πλήθους ἐτῶν.

Φε. διὰ ταῦτα δὴ καὶ βοιμάτιον ἀπώλεσας;

Στ. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπολώλεκ', ἀλλὰ καταπεφρόντικα.

Φε. τὰς δ' ἐμβάδας ποῖ τέτροφας, ὧς νόητε σύ;

Στ. ὥσπερ Περικλῆς, εἰς τὸ δέον ἀπώλεσα.

Now on the reading of the word τέτροφας in this place, there is some disagreement among editors and critics. Some write τέτροπας, but more τέτροφας; these latter also referring it to the root τρέπω, and rendering it by *contulisti, convertisti*,

&c.; which is evidently, I think, the proper interpretation, and the only sufferable one, in this passage. I am aware, too, that *τρέφας* is considered by them as the perfect active of *τρέπω*, from a custom of the Attics in changing *ε* in the penultima of that tense into *ο*; but hence an awkward ambiguity will arise by confounding it with the perfect middle of *τρέφω*. I would, therefore, readily conclude to read with Kuster in his admirable edition, *τρέπας*, if the note of Brunck did not thus in some measure oppose it: "*τρέφας*: Inepte glossæ, κατέφαγες, ἐτράφης. Est a *τρέπω*. Codd. autem omnes et editt. veteres habent *τρέφας*. Kusterus, nescio unde, *τρέπας*."

There is little reason, however, I should apprehend, to suppose that Kuster would have been induced to alter the more common reading, without some satisfactory authority.

Another passage occurs to me wherein some eminent critics have fallen into a similar inconsistency (if I may so term it), with respect to a compound of *τρέφω*. It is in the Trachiniæ of Sophocles, v. 1010. Ed. Brunck; *ἀντρέφας ὃ τι καὶ μύσῃ*. On the authority of Dr. Jones, it appears that Porson and Dr. Maltby erroneously suppose the root of *ἀντρέφας* in this place to be *ἀνατρέπω*, instead of *ἀνατρέφω*. The sentence, then, may be thus rendered: thou hast supplied with fresh nutriments what ought to be lulled asleep; i. e. thou hast added new fuel to the poison that inflames me; or as Dale gives it,

—thou hast roused
The pang that seem'd to sleep.

T. GRIMES.

Colchester, 1829.

NUGÆ.

No. XXIV.—[Continued from No. LXXVI.]

I. RUHNKENII Præfatio ad Hymn. in Cer. p. vi. "Nec tamen cuiquam auctor sim, uti ingenio otioque abutatur ad hymni antiquitatem convellendam.—Quid? an Apollonii Rhodii, et alterius poetæ, qui carmen inter Theocritea xxv. scripsit, auctoritas parvi est facienda? Qui, cum hymni locos exquisitiores ad imitationem vocarint, quantam jam tum vetustatis opinionem habuerint, mani-

festo declarant." And he afterwards quotes a passage from Catullus as originating, either mediately or immediately, in a passage of the hymn. We are not at all disposed to waste our time or our talents, even if we had more of either, in attempting to disprove what we consider to be firmly established by internal evidence, the antiquity of the Hymn to Ceres; were we inclined, however, to any such mischief, we might adduce a parallelism as remarkable, perhaps, as any which can be quoted, and which yet, it appears certain, can be no more than accidental

Ἡ δ' ὀχέων ἐπέβη· παρὰ δὲ κρατὺς Ἀργεϊφόντης,
 ἦνια καὶ μάστιγα λαβὼν μετὰ χερσὶ φίλῃσι,
 σέυε δὲ ἐκ μεγάρων τῶ δ' οὐκ ἔκοντε πετέσθην,
 ῥίμψα δὲ μακρὰ κέλευθα δῖηυσαν· οὐδὲ θάλασσα,
 οὐθ' ὕδωρ ποταμῶν, οὐτ' ἄγρεια ποιήεντα,
 Ἰππων ἀθανάτων, οὐτ' ἄκριες, ἐσχεθον δρομήν,
 ἀλλ' ἐπὲρ αὐτῶν βαθὺν ἤέρα τέμνον ἰόντες. Hymn. in Cer. 377.

— On they move
 Indissolubly firm; nor obvious hill,
 Nor straitening vale, nor wood, nor stream, divides
 Their perfect ranks: for high above the ground
 Their march was, and the passive air upbore
 Their nimble tread. Paradise Lost, vi. 68.

It is indeed possible that Milton may have followed some intermediate poet, who himself imitated the author of the hymn. We, indeed, are acquainted with no such passage, either in Latin or Greek poetry—this, to be sure, is not saying much; neither is Mr. Todd—this is saying still less; but it is more to the purpose to observe that Ruhnken in his notes has not cited any such imitation.

II. Isaiah xiv. 10. "Art thou also become weak as we? art thou become like unto us? thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee. How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds: I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms; that made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; that opened not the house of his prisoners? All the kings of the nations, even all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own house; but thou art cast out of thy grave like an

abominable branch, and as the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with a sword, that go down to the stones of the pit: as a carcase trodden under feet: thou shalt not be joined with them in burial, because thou hast destroyed thy land, and slain thy people: the seed of evil-doers shall never be renowned. Prepare slaughter for his children for the iniquity of their fathers; that they do not rise, nor possess the land, nor fill the face of the world with cities.—For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?"

Ἡ σὺ γὰρ τὰ νῦν πέλεις
 ἡμῖν ὅμοιος; ἢ σέ γ', ὡς ἡμᾶς, κράτους
 ἡμέρας θάνατος; μουσικῆς δέ σοι γλυκὺς
 φθόγγος βέβηκε, καὶ πολυχρυσὸς χλιδή;
 ἴσες δέ σοι κάτωθεν ἑστραυνταί λέχος,
 ἴσες δ' ἄνωθεν; οἷος ἄρ' ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ
 πέπτωκας, ὃ φαέσφορ', ἥριον γένος;
 οἷος πρόκεισαι σπώδιος, ὃς λαῶν τό πρην
 ἰσχὺν ἀπηύστωσας· ἐν δὲ καρδίᾳ
 τοιαύτ' ἐβαλλες· Οὐχὶ παύσεσθαι ποτέ,
 πρὶν ἢν τὸν ἀστερωπὸν ἐμβῆναι ποδὶ
 κύκλον, πύρρον τε τῶν θεοφλέκτων πέρα
 γῆρας ἄλυσον ἐγκαταστήσαι θρόνον·
 ἀκραὶς τ' ἐν ἱεραῖς, ἐνθα δὴ πατήγυρις
 μακάρων κέκληται, θερμὸν ἔρατον πέλας,
 σκηπτροῦσι παυδίκουσιν, ὡς θεὸν, κρατεῖν.
 ὅμοιος δ' ἐρείφει, καὶ καταγισθῆς βίᾳ
 ἔπει πρὸς γῆν· πολλὰ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσί σε
 σκοπῶν τις, εἴη τοῖον ἐκρίβει λόγον·
 Ἄρ' οὕτως ἐστίν, ὃς καθ' ὅπτιον ποτὲ
 γῆν θερμῶν ἔτρεφεν, ἔκ τε βασιλέας
 ἔσεισεν ἀρχῆς, τῆν τε πάμπαν χθόνα
 θρόνῳ ἔφερε, καὶ κατέσκαπεν τάλει·
 τοὺς τ' αἰχμαλώτους ἄσπερ' ἐξ ἀπείρων
 ἔλυσεν δεσμῶν; ὃ κάκιστος δὲ σφαλὲς
 πάντων, ὅσοι πότε ἐν βροταῖς εἶχον κράτη·
 ἄλλοισι μὲν γὰρ εὐκλεῆς πρέπει τάφος,
 ἐν οἷς ὅμοιος δ' ἕκαστος ἀπύκειται πρῆμιν·
 σὺ δ' ἔκ τε πατέρων καὶ ταφῆς ἐβλήμενος
 ἑλκυστός, ἀκράτος, ἀπεβλήτεον ἔκαστην
 ὄζον, πρὶν κίσειαι μοῖρας, ἢ πεπλεγμένον
 ἀνδρὸς θανάτου. ὃς εἶπεν νεοφωγῆς
 χεῖρι πρηνεμετῆς ἐς λυθίστρατον τάφον,
 ἢ σωματίου τοῦ πρὸς τῶν βαδισμένων
 θῆ' ὄψεαι αἶαν ἀρκαμίνους ἔχεις
 λαῶν, πολέτας δ' ἄρ' ὅπως ἀπώλεσας.
 κοινῶν γὰρ ὄππῃ ἔστιν οὐκ αἰεὶ γένος.
 θανάτου δὲ πᾶσι καὶ φόνους περιωπτόων,
 ἔργων ἕκαστι πατρὸς, ὡς καὶ δὴ ποτὲ
 ἀνθρώπων αἰῶν, ὑπὲρ πατρίαν χθόνα
 στήθεσσι, ὑπὲρ πύλινον ἐκκλίστασι γῆν. . . .
 φέρε γὰρ αὖν ἔκαστος τις πῦρ ἀσπασαί·
 φέρε δ' ἔτι καὶ, τίς κατωπρινέει, χεῖρα.

III. Thucyd. vii. 9, ad fin. ὁ δὲ [Νικίας], τὰ κατὰ τὸ σπαράττειν διὰ φυλακῆς ἤδη ἔχων, ἐκουσίῳ κινδύνῳ ἐπεμελεῖτο. Various explanations, as well as emendations, of this passage have been attempted by the commentators, and hitherto with little success. Quære, ἐκ. κ. ἐπεμελεῖτο? The verb ἀπομελεῖσθαι does not occur in the lexicons, nor do we remember it in any Greek author; but it is formed by analogy, and may well be conceived to have existed; if of rare occurrence, it would not be the less Thucydidean. The meaning of the word would be, "he left off caring for," or concerning himself about; corresponding to the force of ἀπὸ in ἀπαλγεῖν, &c. "He no longer thought of engaging in any risks except such as were forced on him."

ΒΟΙΩΤΟΣ.

"THE TRAVELS OF IBN BATÚTA, translated from the abridged Arabic Manuscript Copies preserved in the Public Library of Cambridge; with Notes, illustrative of the History, Geography, Botany, Antiquities, &c. occurring throughout the work." By the REV. SAMUEL LEE, B.D. Also, D.D. of the University of Halle; Hon. Member of the Asiatic Society of Paris; Hon. Associate of the Royal Society of Literature; Member of the Oriental Translation Committee, and of the Royal Asiatic Society; and Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. London, 1829. 4to.

WE hail this publication as eminently auspicious to the interests of Oriental literature, regarding "*Ibn Batúta's Travels*" as the forerunner of many valuable works that may be expected to follow in rapid succession. For these (of which some are already far advanced on their passage through the press) our obligations shall be most gratefully acknowledged to the "*Oriental Translation Committee*," instituted last year (1828) by several members of the *Royal Asiatic Society*, among whom Colonel Fitzclarence appears to have been particularly active and zealous. To this gentleman, therefore, (himself an accomplished traveller and ingenious writer) the work of Ibn Batúta is appropriately dedicated by its learned translator, as the first-fruits of an institution whose origin and efficiency may be almost wholly ascribed to his exertions. Subjoining in the form

of a note some particulars respecting this institution,¹ we proceed to give an account of the volume before us.

The Arabic Mss., used by Professor Lee in his translation, are three copies of the same abridgment, bequeathed to the University of Cambridge by the late celebrated traveller Burckhardt, who was unable to procure the great original work of Ibn Batûta, although he knew that a copy existed at Cairo; this he tells us in the Appendix to his Nubian Travels, (p. 534.) where he also men-

¹ Under the immediate sanction of the King, as Patron, twenty-one Vice-Patrons were chosen: among whom we find the Royal Dukes of Clarence, Sussex, and Gloucester, Prince Leopold, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, Duke of Wellington, Marquis of Lansdowne, Earl Spencer, Lord Wm. Bentinck, Lords Melville, Goderich, Greenvile, Ellenborough, and other distinguished persons: whilst the Committee (amounting to nearly one hundred) elected as their Chairman the Right Hon. Sir Gore Ouseley, and as Deputy-Chairmen, Sir George Staunton, Sir Alexander Johnston, and Lieut.-Col. Fitzclarence. A subscription was then proposed, and attended with such success, that the annual amount exceeds already twelve hundred guineas. By means of this sum, and further contributions that may with confidence be expected, it is proposed "to publish, free of expense to the authors, translations of the whole or parts of such works in the Oriental languages as the Oriental Translation Committee shall approve. These translations will sometimes be accompanied by the original texts, printed separately, and such illustrations as may be considered necessary. By the occasional publication of the original text, it is intended to multiply copies of such works as are scarce, and to furnish students, at a moderate expense, with correct copies of the best Asiatic works to which they might not otherwise have access." (Report of the Or. Trans. Comm.) It is not intended that the operations of this Committee should be restricted to the printing of translations or texts, from Arabic, Persian, Syriac, or Turkish Mss. They are to comprehend the most interesting works in Sanscrit, Chinese, Cingalese, Burmese; in the languages of Thibet and Tartary, in Malayan, and other dialects of the Eastern Archipelago, of Hindustân, &c. &c. To encourage translators, it is resolved that four medals (of twenty guineas value each) shall be annually presented as tokens of distinction, and that four sums of money (from fifty to one hundred pounds each), shall be bestowed as rewards for the most approved translations. Every annual subscriber of ten guineas is to receive a fine paper copy of all the works published by the Committee, with his name printed on the title-page. Every annual subscriber of five guineas will be entitled to all the works, as far as the amount of his subscription, at half the price paid by non-subscribers. The translator, or editor himself, will receive a certain number of copies (we believe twenty-five) for his own disposal. The remainder will be sold to the public, and the amount applied to promote the objects of the Committee and the advancement of Oriental literature. We understand that eight or nine very curious and valuable works may be expected from the Committee's different presses before the close of this year.

tions that Ibn Batúta was a native of Tandja (Tangiers in Barbary), and thence styled Tandjy. So vast was the extent of his various journeys by land, "that," says Burckhardt, "when I first rapidly ran over his book, I took him for no better than Damberger, the pseudo-African traveller; but a more careful perusal has convinced me that he had really been in the places, and seen what he describes." Having given a slight sketch of his routes, Burckhardt adds, "this is sufficient to show the importance of the travels of Ibn Batúta, and to warrant the opinion that he was the greatest known traveller of any age, as far at least as relates to the quantity of ground travelled over. The information contained in his complete work regarding the north of Persia, India, China, and the interior of Africa, must be invaluable."

In hopes of obtaining that complete work, Professor Lee suspended, during some years, his translation of the Arabic abridgment; and the public would have rejoiced with us, had such a literary treasure fallen into his hands: but we accept most thankfully the present epitome, enriched as it is by the learned translator's notes.

It appears that Sheikh Ibn Batúta

left his native city Tangiers, for the purpose of performing the pilgrimage in the 725th year of the Hejira, A.D. 1324-5. (p. 3.)

and proceeded by way of Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoly, to Alexandria. Here he saw the learned Judge Fakhr Oddín el Ríki, who owed his good fortune to the favorable interpretation of an omen; for, on his first arrival at the city from a distant place, he resolved not to enter, until some accidental circumstance should encourage him. He sat accordingly near the gate; and the hour of closing it approached, when the porter, irritated at his delay, said to him ironically, "Enter Mr. Judge:" he replied, "Yes, judge, if that be God's will." He was then rather poor; but having entered a college, he applied himself to learning with so much success, that the king of Egypt in process of time appointed him to be judge of Alexandria. (p. 7.) Here, in consequence of an extraordinary conversation, our author determined to visit distant regions. At the time of his residence in Alexandria, one of the greatest saints of the city was Borhán Oddín el Aaraj: "I perceive," said he to Ibn Batúta, who had paid him a visit, "that you are fond of travelling into various countries." Our author answered in the affirmative, although he did not at that time entertain a notion of travelling into very distant countries. The saint replied,

You must visit my brother Farid Oddín in India, and my brother Rokn Oddín Ibn Zakaryá in Sindia, and also my brother Borhán Oddín in China; and when you see them, present my compliments to them.

Astonished at what he said, Ibn Batúta resolved to visit those

countries; accomplished his design; met the three persons above-mentioned, and presented to them the compliments of their brother the saint. (p. 7.)

Having proceeded to Damietta, our author relates an anecdote of the Sheikh Jamál Oddín el Sáwi, leader of the sect of Kalenders (or Karenders), those who shave their chins and eyebrows.

It is said that the reason which induced the sheikh to shave off his beard and eyebrows was the following: he was a well-made and handsome man: one of the women of Sâwah consequently fell in love with him. After this she was constantly sending to the sheikh, presenting herself to him in the street, and otherwise soliciting his society: this he completely resisted. When she was tired of this, she suborned an old woman to stop him on his way to the mosque with a sealed letter in her hand. When the sheikh passed by her she said, "Good Sir, can you read?" "Yes," he replied. She said, "this letter has been sent to me by my son; I wish you would read it for me." He answered, "I will." But when she had opened the letter, she said, "Good Sir, my son has a wife, who is in yonder house; could I beg the favor of your reading the letter at the door, so that she may hear?" To this he also assented: but when he had got through the first door, the old woman closed it; and out came the woman with her slaves, and hung about him. They then took him into an inner apartment, and the mistress began to take liberties with him. When the sheikh saw that there was no escaping, he said, "I will do what you like; show me a sleeping-room." This she did: he then took in with him some water and a razor which he had, and shaved off his beard and both his eyebrows. He then presented himself to the woman, who detesting both his person and his deed, ordered him to be driven out of the house. Thus, by Divine Providence, was his chastity preserved. This appearance he retained ever after; and every one who embraced his opinions also submitted to the shaving off of his beard and both his eyebrows. (p. 12.)

Ibn Batúta then proceeded to Misr (or Cairo); and mentions some of the learned men who flourished there in his time. He celebrates the Nile; which excels all other rivers in the sweetness of its taste, the extent of its progress, and the benefits it confers.

"The course of the Nile, moreover," he says, "is in a direction from the south to the north, contrary to that of all other rivers." (p. 13.)

Having passed through many other places in Egypt, he set out for Syria (A. H. 726. A. D. 1326.): saw the tombs of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and those of their wives: went on to Jerusalem, visited the tomb of Jonas, and Bethlehem, the birth-place of Jesus, Askalon, Acca, Tyre, Sidon, and some parts of Tiberias, where was the tomb of Shoaib (Jethro). He then proceeded to Tarábalus (Tripoli) in Syria, Emessa, and the city of Hamáh; to Sarmin and Haleb, or Aleppo, Antioch, and the fortress of El Kahf. Here he mentions the people called Ismáíliah, or Fidawia (sometimes termed assassins), among whom no stranger can venture.

"They act," says he, "as arrows for El Malek El Násir; and by their

means he comes at such of his enemies as are far removed from him, as in Irák and other places. They have their various offices; and when the sultan wishes to despatch one of them to waylay an enemy, he bargains with him for the price of his blood. If then the man succeeds, and comes safely back, he gets the reward; but if he fails, it is then given to his heirs. These men have poisoned knives, and with these they strike the persons they are sent to kill." (p. 27.)

Our traveller next visited Jabala, Laodicea, and Mount Libanus, Baalbek, and Damascus. On the subject of this ancient city we shall here extract part of the learned translator's note, given in p. 29.

There is a passage in the book of Genesis (xv. 2.) in which our authorised version has, "This Eliezer of Damascus;" and which I believe to be erroneous. The original stands thus, דַּמְשֵׁק אֱלִיעֶזֶר, not אֱלִיעֶזֶר דַּמְשֵׁק as the version gives it. My opinion is, that this is the proper name of Abraham's servant, and nothing more: Damascus might, indeed, have been built by him; but of this we have no knowledge.

Ibn Batúta then proceeded on a pilgrimage to Medina, where he duly performed his religious duties at the Prophet's tomb; then entered the territory of Nejd, and arrived at Kadesia, where the ancient fire-worship was extinguished by the victory which Saad, one of Omar's generals, obtained over the Persians. Our traveller having visited the *Meshhed*, "where the grave of Ali is thought to be," went on to Basra: proceeding with some Badawín Arabs, "for there is no travelling in these parts except with them," he visited Khawárnak, where traces of an ancient palace are still visible, near a river derived from the Euphrates. He then visited the city of Wásit; and mentions a sect called El Repháia, of whom some "will take great serpents in their teeth and bite the head off," besides trampling on a great fire, rolling in it, and even eating it without injury. (p. 34.) He mentions a religious sect in India who performed the same trick.

Our limits oblige us to pass without any notice many of the places visited by this indefatigable traveller. Having entered Persia, he arrived at the city of Tostar; then proceeded to the country called El Lúr, in which was the town of Idhaj, belonging to Sultan Atábek Afrásiab; then to Isphahán, a large and handsome city; then to Shiráz, Kázerún, Huwaiza, Kúfa, Hilla, Karbela, and Baghdad, where he noticed the graves of several Mohammedan saints. From Baghdad he accompanied the Sultan Abu Saíd for ten days on his march with a numerous army; then went with one of the emírs to Tabriz, but soon returned to Baghdad, visited Mosul and Diarbeker, Samarra, Nisíbín Sinjár, inhabited by the Kurds, a generous and warlike people. He then set out for Mecca; whence he proceeded to Judda, there embarked for Yemen, but was driven by the wind into Sawakin: thence he went to Hali, peopled by aboriginal Arabs; to Tiazz,

the residence of the king of Yemen; to Senaá its capital, and to Aden on the sea-shore. He next visited Zanguebar; describes the betel-tree and cocoa-nut; the country of Ammán; the city of Hormuz, Lár, Kaisa or Siráf-Bahrein, Yemama or Hajr; and again reached Mecca (A. H. 733. A. D. 1332.): thence proceeded to Cairo, explored the province of Anatolia; saw a black and exceedingly hard stone which had fallen from heaven, and weighed above a hundred pounds. (p. 72.) He next visited El Kiram (Crim), Astrachan, and Constantinople; here he was introduced to the emperor, who sat on a throne with his queen and daughter. After a very long journey he arrived in Khavárezm, a very large and populous city.

"I have never seen," says he, "better bred or more liberal people than the inhabitants of Khavárezm, or those who are more friendly to strangers: they have a very commendable practice with regard to their worship, which is this: when any one absents himself from his place in the mosque, he is beaten by the priest in the presence of the congregation, and moreover, fined in five dinars, which go towards repairing the mosque. In every mosque, therefore, a whip is hung up for this purpose." p. 86.)

He next visited Bokhára, Nakhshab, Samarkand, and Balkh, which had not recovered from "its destruction by the cursed Jengiz Khán:" then Herat, Nisábúr, Bustám, and other places on his way to Kabel and the Panj Ab. We now (p. 100.) enter on his account of Hindustan, which occupies several chapters, and forms a highly interesting portion of Ibn Batúta's work: it seems, indeed, to retain more of the original matter than any other part of this abridgment. At Delhi our accomplished traveller was appointed judge of that city by the emperor, who assigned to him an annual allowance of twelve thousand dinars; but having incurred the sultan's displeasure, he soon resigned that appointment, and attached himself

to the holy and pious sheikh, the saint and phoenix of his age, Kamál Abd Ullah El Gazi, who had wrought many open miracles. (p. 100.)

The sultan, however, again taking our author into favor, resolved to send him as ambassador to the Emperor of China; and being furnished with dresses of honor, horses, and money, he set out, (A. H. 743. A. D. 1342.) but on the way was attacked and taken prisoner by a party of infidel Hindoos, from whom with great difficulty he escaped, having previously been stripped of all that he possessed.

From Delhi he once more set out, and visited Gwalior, the Mah-country, Kambaya, Goa, and Malabar; Kalikut, the Mal-lands, Ceylon, Sumatra, and Java. At last he arrives in and devotes a whole chapter (the 23rd) to his account of it, which is extremely curious. He again visits Sumatra and Kalikut;

proceeds to Zafar in Arabia, Hormuz, Shiraz, and Isphahan; Basra, Aleppo, Cairo, Mecca, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Fez, Tangiers, Gibraltar, Morocco, the Great Desert, and Tambactu. At length (in the year of our era 1353) he arrived at Fez,

"the residence of the commander of the faithful, to whom," says he, "I presented myself, and kissed hands. I now finished my travels, and took up my residence in this country. May God be praised."

Having rapidly traced our indefatigable Ibn Batûta through the principal regions which he visited (although unable to notice in this sketch a multiplicity of less important places named by him), we revert to those chapters of his work wherein he describes Hindustan, and notices some particulars worthy of the reader's attention, while many circumstances in his narration evince a considerable share of credulity and superstition. We would refer the reader to his account of the Indian couriers, horse and foot; (p. 101.) of the ruined city, where stones, resembling in shape men, beasts, herbs, and even seeds, are found in prodigious numbers; and it is believed that the ancient inhabitants were, as a punishment for their sins, transformed by the Almighty into stones. (p. 102.) He saw some of "those women who burn themselves when their husbands die." (p. 108.) And he mentions those Hindoos who from religious motives drown themselves in the river Ganges. (p. 110.)

Having incurred the emperor's suspicion, he was ordered to attend at the palace-gate whilst a council sat within.

"I attended," says he, "in this way for four days; and few were those who did so who escaped death. I betook myself, however, to continual fasting, and tasted nothing but water. On the first day I repeated the sentence, 'God is our support, and the most excellent patron,' *three and thirty thousand* times; and after the fourth day, by God's goodness was I delivered; but the sheikh and all those who visited him, except myself, were put to death." (p. 150.)

In the city of Barun many wild beasts entered, and tore the inhabitants; but it was suspected that the magicians, called *Jogeess*, had assumed the form of wild beasts. These *Jogeess* are

a people who can work miracles; of which one is, that any of them can keep an entire fast for several months. (p. 157.)

Some among them can kill a person with a look; the woman who does so is termed a *Goftar*. A woman, suspected of being a *Goftar*, had killed a child, and was brought before the vizier,

who ordered four large water-vessels to be filled with water, and tied to her. She was then thrown into the great river (the Jumna). She did not sink in the water, but remained unhurt; so they knew that she was a *Goftar*. The vizier then ordered her to be burnt, which was done. (p. 161.)

Here the learned translator remarks, that some of our own sup-

posed witches have been treated very nearly in the same manner. Two of those magicians so astonished Ibn Batúta by their wonderful transformations, "that he fainted and fell to the earth," and took a palpitation at the heart. (p. 162.) His account of the Maldivé Islands will be found extremely curious. Here it appears that notwithstanding his extraordinary devotion and his zeal in studying the sacred Koran, which he sometimes read through once or even twice in a day; (p. 174.) he still made such domestic arrangements as left him sufficient leisure for very ample indulgence in the delights of female society.

"I had," says he, "some slave-girls and four wives during my residence here. The people are religious, chaste, and peaceable: they eat what is lawful, and their prayers are answered. Their bodies are weak. They make no war; and their weapons are prayers." (p. 176.) "Whenever a traveller enters these islands, he may marry for a very small dowry one of the handsomest women for any specific period." (p. 177.)

His account of Ceylon abounds with interesting information; and in various parts his work will gratify the lovers of natural history: yet it was not always in search of rare animals, plants, or minerals, that our author undertook laborious and dangerous expeditions. From a place called Sadkawan in Bengal, he performed a journey of one month to the mountains of Kamru, adjoining those of Thibet,

where there are musk-gazelles. The inhabitants of these mountains are, like the Turks, famous for their attention to magic. My object in visiting these mountains was to meet one of the saints; namely, the Sheikh Jalal Oddin of Tebriz. This sheikh was one of the greatest saints, and one of those singular individuals who had the power of working great and notable miracles, &c. (p. 195.)

We should far exceed our present limits by any attempt to notice even a tenth part of the details respecting Java and China, which claim the inquisitive reader's attention; or a twentieth part of the valuable notes with which Professor Lee has illustrated the most obscure or difficult passages. We shall here take the first note that presents itself, as a specimen of the manner in which this learned translator has explained an Arabic word, and at the same time thrown light on a passage in the Hebrew Scriptures.

"To express couriers, horse and foot, the term used," says Ibn Batúta, "was *El Woldák*, الولدك. The note informs us that this word signifies quick, hasting, &c. from the Arabic root ولى, properavit, &c. The Eastern couriers are generally some part of the king's forces; and when the despatches are important, are officers of distinction, as it is the case in our own military affairs. These among the ancient Hebrews were generally termed רצים *runners*: a term perfectly synonymous with that used here, ولدك or دواك, (which is perhaps an erroneous reading for دوان the Persian word for *runner*). This will elucidate an obscure pas-

sage in Psalm xix. 5. where we have 'rejoiceth as a *strong man* to run a race.' The word answering to strong man is in the original נָבוֹר, which means *hero*. In the translation, too, we have a *race*; but as we know of no races among the Hebrews, we are reduced to some difficulty as to what could here have been intended by the writer. In the original, however, we have אָרַר, which means nothing more than a way, road, or path; and the sense is, rejoiceth as a hero to run the road; i. e. to bear the despatches of his master with the greatest possible celerity and safety. This makes the whole passage easy and plain: it exhibits the sun as an officer honored by the Almighty to bear the announcement of his powers, through every clime of his dominion, in a language silent, but expressive and equally intelligible to all." (p. 101.)

It would give us great satisfaction to hear that the complete work of Ibn Batûta had been found at Cairo, Tripoli, or elsewhere, and placed in the hands of that able translator and learned commentator who has rendered the abridgment so interesting and instructive.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE TRUTH OF HISTORY.

No. III.—[Continued from No. LXXVII.]

Hæc ætas, jam exulta præsertim et erudita, omne, quod fieri non potest, respuat.—*Cicero*.

MITFORD.

"ARGOS¹ had not, with the power, lost all the pride of its antient præminence among the Grecian states." At the time when the Greeks were preparing to oppose Xerxes, Argos was "weak still from slaughter in battle, and the massacre which followed in the invasion under Cleomenes; nourishing since those events an encreased animosity against Lacedæmon, and fearing worse oppression from neighboring Greeks than from the distant Persian, the Argians applied to the Delphian oracle for advice, or perhaps rather negotiated for a sanction to resolutions already taken. The response, evidently composed by a friend to the Argians, appears, as far as it can be understood, to favor their antient pretension to superiority over all other Grecian states, and at the same time to direct them to enter into no league for common defense, but merely to provide for their own security."

Even in the present days of liberality, great men are apt to

¹ Vol. ii. cap. 8. sect. 2.

... that their advice is asked it shall be followed. A due appreciation of the great oracle of Delphi, which was as the voice of a god to many of the Greeks, and a befitting sense of gratitude for a power which flattered their pride and consulted their security, would have withheld the Argians from bringing any discredit on the oracle by slighting its advice. "Since you have made this inquiry," said Socrates to Xenophon, "you must do what the god has ordered."¹ Their own weakness also should have induced them to husband their small resources; for besides the slaughter in battle, and the massacre which followed, we must bear in mind that of a thousand Argians, who at a subsequent period had come to assist the Eginetans of the island, the greater part were slain;² and that between the slaughter in battle and the massacre which followed, so large a portion of the Argian people perished, that the slaves rose upon the scanty remainder, overpowered them, and for some years commanded the city.³

In the time of our own crusades, those who staid at home contrived to turn the heroism of others to their own account. If their own weakness and the protection of the oracle had led the Argians to set a high value on their assistance; if, like the Swiss of a later day, they had sold their services; a knowledge of human nature would have hindered us from condemning them. From Mr. Mitford's account, however, it seems that in his opinion the Argians required merely "that the Lacedæmonians should bind themselves to maintain peace with them for thirty years; and then they said that though the command among the Grecian states justly belonged to Argos, yet they would be content to share it equally with Sparta. The Lacedæmonian deputies hesitated, and gave an unsatisfactory answer. The Argians closed the conference with declaring that the Spartan arrogance was intolerable, and that they would rather be commanded by the barbarians than be subject to Lacedæmon; and they ordered the ministers to leave the Argian territory before sun-set, on pain of being treated as enemies."

We must take for granted that the Argians were serious in making their proposal: to a disregard of the Delphic oracle, they would hardly have added a wanton ridicule of the necessities of those neighbouring Greeks from whom they feared oppression; but by what means could they have supported the burden which they offered to take upon them? As emperor of Germany, Maximilian had an undoubted right to precedence; yet Maximilian was at one time the hireling of our Henry the Eighth.

Philip the Second of Spain, "that sad intelligencing tyrant who mischief'd the world from his mines of Ophir," was an absolute prince, and his intended invasion of England was sanctioned by

¹ Anabasis, lib. iii. cap. 2.

² Mitford, vol. ii. c. 7. s. 3. p. 89.

³ Mitford, vol. ii. c. 7. s. 3. p. 85.

the pope; yet the Armada was delayed through the instrumentality of a merchant. If we enquire into the cause which had such power over Maximilian and Philip, we shall find that they both were in want of money.

How much power the reader will allow to this said cause, when the Greeks are concerned, is not for me to determine; but if he admits that the Argians could not have armed and supported their troops without some expense, let him not allege that the silver-mine at Laureium would have supplied the necessary ways and means in this instance also. That mine, whatever may have been its richness, was not altogether like the purse of Fortunatus. If Persuasion was one of the great gods, which the Athenians brought with them against Andros after the battle of Salamis, Necessity was the other. Hippias,¹ when master of Athens, cried down the silver coin, and having thus collected it, re-issued it at its original value; and this was not the only expedient by which he raised money. The Athenian exchequer, therefore, both before the battle of Marathon and after that of Salamis, was not superfluously rich; and it is probable that the Argians would have had to bear their own charges, if their proposal had been accepted; and on examination we shall find it more than probable that commerce had not enabled the Argians to lay up much treasure. How great then must have been that pride of antient pre-eminence, which could incline the weak state of Argos to act offensively against Persia!

"The Greeks," says Mitford, "had long had intelligence of the immense preparations making in Asia: professedly for the punishment of Athens, but evidently enough with more extensive views of conquest. Yet still, as on the former invasion, no measures were concerted in common for the general defense of the country. On the contrary, many of the small republics readily and even zealously made the demanded acknowledgement of subjection to the great king, by the delivery of earth and water. Nor will this appear strange to those who read the honest historian of the age, and consider the real state of things in the country, however it may militate with later declamation on Grecian patriotism and love of liberty. For it was surely no unreasonable opinion, held by many, that the might of Persia was irresistible."² It was not, therefore, from a comparison between the might of Persia and the might of Greece that the politicians of Argos could anticipate success; neither could they feel assured that success would benefit them. By sharing the command equally with Sparta, they would

¹ The anecdote, with a variety of others, is to be found in the second book of Aristotle's *Economics*; but as to the said book, *Suspicio est non esse Aristotelis*.

Vol. ii. c. 8. s. 2.

be bound to maintain a rivalry in deeds as well as in words with Sparta, or they themselves would numbe that very pride which they meant to gratify. But what hero and the state of Argos¹ possess, who could claim an equality with Leonidas, a Spartan king, who boasted a descent from Hercules, and whose character could not have been unknown to his neighbours, though he had as yet had no public opportunity for making conspicuous his superior genius and unshaken courage? The Argians might have hoped to be victorious, but they never could have hoped for a bloodless victory over the might of Persia. Could Argos bear a loss in men so well as Sparta? Leonidas and his chosen band fell at Thermopylæ: casualties must have occurred in the expedition against the Argians, in the expedition to Tempe, and return from it; and in the sea-fights off Artemisium and Salamis. Leotychidas, a Spartan king, and commander of that allied force which gained a double triumph at Mycale, could not have been unaccompanied by a Spartan force: yet notwithstanding all these deductions, the Spartans had 50,000 men in the field at Platæa; they had at least a thousand at Megara; and a sufficient number remained to ensure tranquility at home.

Laconia and Messenia formed one kingdom, and were subject to the same rule; but Mycenæ was independent of Argos, though only ten miles distant from it. Epidaurus and Trœzene and Tiryns were likewise independent; and so little were these four states inclined to make common cause with Argos, that Mycenæ thought it worth while to send eighty men to the army of Leonidas. Epidaurus furnished eight, and Trœzene five ships; and at the battle of Platæa there were 1000 Trœzenians, 800 Epidaurians, 400 Mycenæans and Tirynthians, each accompanied by a slave, who did duty as a light-armed soldier.

Weak from slaughter and massacre; weak from the servile war which followed; weak from the loss of nearly 1000 men at Egina; possessing but a small part of a small territory, subject to the never-failing disorders of a Greek republic; Argos could ill spare a single man, whether slave or free; and would have had good cause for obeying the friendly oracle, even although she had not feared worse oppression from neighbouring Greeks than from the distant Persian. It was agreed that all enmities among the Greeks themselves should cease; and the Athenians and Eginetans were

¹ "Of the states on the continent of Greece, Argos was among the first to abolish monarchy; or, however, so to reduce its powers, that we hardly perceive among historians whether it existed or no." Mitford, vol. i. c. 4. s. 2. It was, however, a monarchy at this time: for the Spartans alleged as a reason for not sharing the command equally, that they had two kings and the Argians but one. See their speech in Herodotus.

seemingly on the best terms, but was it likely that this harmony would continue?

"The utmost energy of the nervous style of Thucydides, and the copiousness and expression of the Greek language, seem to sink under that historian, when he attempts to describe the disorders which arose from faction throughout all the Grecian commonwealths. You would imagine that he still labours with a thought greater than he can find words to communicate. And he concludes his pathetic description with an observation, which is at once refined and solid. In these contests, says he, those who were duller and most stupid, and had the least foresight, commonly prevailed. For being conscious of this weakness, and dreading to be over-reached by those of greater penetration, they went to work hastily, without premeditation, by the sword and poniard, and thereby got the start of their antagonists, who were forming fine schemes and projects for their destruction."¹

A worse state of things cannot easily be imagined; but does the description suit the cotemporaries of Leonidas and Themistocles? Let us examine. The Athenians were in most repute for civilization; yet Solon, their famous lawgiver, had sanctioned the most abominable of all vices.² Xerxes had taken 500 Athenians who were left in Attica, and had sent them to Asia immediately after the battle of Salamis; Aristides the just "landing on Psytalia put all the Persians there to the sword." The latter of these two events happened during the battle of Salamis; and is described by Æschylus in terms which sufficiently shew that the Persians, who are said to have been the flower of the army, and to have been 400 in number, were butchered:³ the former of the two is mentioned incidentally only by Herodotus; but it is connected with circumstances which ought to warrant its truth. Before the battle of Mycale, the Samians are said to have incurred some suspicion from the Persian leaders, by their generous kindness to about 500 Athenian prisoners, who had been brought from Attica and disposed of as slaves in Asia Minor. They had ransomed all, and sent them with subsistence to Athens. The Samian troops in

¹ Hume on the populousness of ancient nations.

² *Anabat more Græcorum*, contains a meaning which should qualify our admiration of the Greeks. Why have the Jews hated the Greeks, and why do we hear so little of Jews in the Morea? Is it because Edom, Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon, are still to be found in the Morea? If so, the vice above-mentioned may easily be accounted for. Pausanias observed that Greece never wanted a traitor: late events have not contradicted this observation.

³ *Κροκοποιΐαι* is a strong word; and Æschylus is said to have been a gallant soldier: yet the description which he puts into the mouth of the messenger implies what we should call a carnage.

the Persian army were therefore deprived of their arms.¹ Mitford has not stated how these Athenian prisoners were brought from Attica; but the original historian expressly mentions that they came in the ships of the barbarians. Xerxes had also spared the lives of the spies; had directed that they should be carried round the whole army; and, after seeing every thing, should be dismissed with passports to go where they pleased. The war had originated in the burning of Sardis by the Athenians; so that when we consider all the circumstances, we shall have little reason to praise the humanity of the just Aristides; but we ought rather to allow that Xerxes shewed some forbearance in not retaliating upon his Athenian prisoners, 500 of whom were completely in his power; not to mention the crews of the five galleys which had been taken at Artemisium.²

In the Trojan war, and in the Peloponnesian war, the Greeks were careful to pay funeral honours to the dead. "The Athenians," says Potter, "seem to have been careful to excess and superstition in procuring an honourable interment for the bodies of their own soldiers that had valiantly lost their lives: insomuch, that the ten admirals that gained the famous victory over the Lacedæmonians in the sea-fight at Arginusæ were put to death chiefly on this pretence, that they were said not to have taken due care in gathering the bodies that floated on the waves; when yet they alleged that they were hindered by a tempest, which might have been dangerous to the whole fleet, had they not provided for their safety by a timely retreat. This, no doubt, was one cause why, after a battle upon the Corinthian territory, Nicias, the Athenian general, finding that two of his men were left by an oversight when they carried off the dead, made an halt, and sent an herald to the enemy for leave to carry them off, hereby renouncing all title to the victory, which belonged to him before, and losing the honour of erecting a trophy; for it was presumed that he who asked leave to carry off his dead, could not be master of the field. After that, Chabrias having put to flight the Lacedæmonians at Naxos, rather than leave any of his soldiers or their bodies to the mercy of the waves, chose to desist from prosecuting his victory, when he was in a fair way to have destroyed the enemy's whole fleet."³

Stronger instances than these cannot be wished; but what care

¹ See Mitford, c. 9. s. 4. Where shall we find any mention of the gratitude of the Athenians?

² My authority is not Mitford, but Herodotus; who particularly mentions that they were taken by the Egyptians. Xerxes is reported to have ill treated the body of Leonidas; but according to another rumour he covered it with a purple cloak. If we want to justify the barbarity of Aristides by the alleged barbarity of Xerxes, we must begin by shewing that Aristides was aware of this alleged barbarity.

³ *Archæologia Græca*, book iii. c. 11.

did the Athenians take of the bodies of those who fell at Artemisium and Salamis and Platæa? The Greeks lost many ships and many men at Artemisium; but they remained masters of the dead and of the wreck: a council of war was held immediately after the engagement, and the Greeks resolved to retreat. The resolution was farther confirmed, and the measure hastened by the arrival of Abroynychus. It was then resolved not to delay for a moment the retreat of the fleet. The whole moved in the accidental order of the instant.¹ Is it not evident from this account that the Greeks neither burnt nor buried their dead, nor gave themselves any trouble about the crews of the five ships, which had been taken by the Egyptians? If, therefore, they did not abandon their dead, they must have taken them on board. The dead were many; the Greek fleet had been greatly damaged in the engagement; and as the Greek ships were so scanty in accommodation, that the crews took their meals on shore, we must admit that if the dead bodies were taken on board, that pious duty was not accomplished without great diligence and exertion.

"Themistocles, ever fertile in expedients, conceived the idea of making even the flight of his fellow-countrymen useful to his country." In what manner? "With some of the swiftest galleys of the squadron under his command, he went to the watering-places of the road of Artemisium; and there on the rocks he wrote thus:—Men of Ionia, you do ill in making war upon your fathers," &c. &c. To write on rocks is no easy work; and as the matter engraved fills more than ten lines in Schweighæuser's text, the best stone-cutters of the present day, with all appliances and means to boot, would have but little spare time left if they were to set about such a job in the morning, provided they made the letters large and legible: that Themistocles did so, seems clear; for the Ionians read the inscriptions. Themistocles, however, laboured under great disadvantages. Immediately after a hard battle, a council of war was held, and the Greeks resolved to retreat. As more than half the Attic squadron was disabled, we must conclude that the Athenians had exerted themselves, and of course Themistocles was not idle: in a council of war he naturally took an active part; and as commander of the Attic squadron, it would be his duty to see that the resolution to retreat was properly executed by the Athenians. After this he had to go to the watering-places, to find rocks or stones that were capable of accommodating so long an inscription, and to engrave² the inscrip-

¹ See Mitford.

² *Ἐντάμυνον ἐν τοῖσι λίθοισι γράμματα.* If this means merely writing, we have a curious notice of antient lithography. Pope's lines on Craggs are thought too long for the legend of a medal. What shall we think of the lines on the Artemisian crags?

claimed the second to themselves; so did the Athenians. As for antiquity, the Athenians were as old as the hills; and the Tegeans, by virtue of their being Arcadians, were older than the moon. Under such circumstances, Argos could not well expect that her sharing the command equally with Sparta, and consequently taking the precedence of every other state, would promote cordiality and unanimity. The success of her arms and counsels might restore to her some of her antient glory; but out of the nettle danger was she likely to pluck the flower safety? Jealousies would arise; the other states of Argolis might take alarm; Arcadia might become a troublesome neighbour; and the truce for thirty years might be broken in as many months, for the Lacedæmonians were apt to say one thing and mean another.¹ Cleomenes indeed was dead; but the burnt child is said to dread the fire: the animosity of Argos had increased, and

Yet her cicatrice look'd raw and red
After the Spartan sword.

Cleomenes with his iron money had found means to corrupt the Delphic oracle; and although the Athenians, Eginetans, &c. might now be sworn brothers in arms, the Argives must have known that almost every Grecian state contained within itself the elements of discord and revolution. At Athens, the Alcæonidæ had been suspected of traitorous correspondence with Persia. The "Peisistratid Athenians" were not inactive; and Themistocles the incomparable had procured the banishment of Aristides the just: Demaratus, the banished king of Sparta, was with Xerxes: the insurrections of the Helots were always to be dreaded: the barren rock of Egina had been very fertile in dissensions; and Argos itself had been obliged through its weakness to incorporate some of the neighbouring inhabitants with its citizens.² Even in success, therefore, there might be causes of discord; but in defeat, what chance of safety would there be for the leading men of Argos? The oracle had almost condemned the Athenians to despair, and had told the Argives themselves to be quiet. To act in opposition to the oracle—to thrust themselves forward against the will of the confederates—to be defeated, and to be responsible for the defeat; these were alarming considerations for those who knew the fate of the just Aristides and the victorious Miltiades. But there was a still more alarming consideration—the vengeance of Persia. The Argives, according to their own account,³ were from

¹ An extract from Schweighæuser's Index to his Herodotus will be no bad evidence: "Lacedæmoniis mos est alia cogitare, alia dicere, ix. 54. Cf. v. 92. vi. 108. viii. 142. coll. ix. 7."

² The authority for this assertion is not Herodotus, but Aristotle. See his Politics, lib. v. c. 3.

³ See Herodotus, lib. vii.

the first aware of the preparations of Persia ; and on learning that the Greeks meant to solicit their aid against that power, they asked the Delphic oracle what was best for them to do, for that 6000 of their nation had lately been killed by the Lacedæmonians and Cleomenes ; and their reason for demanding a thirty years' truce, was, that their sons might grow up to manhood before its expiration ; for they dreaded being again subjected to the Lacedæmonians in case any disaster should befall them in the Persian war.

Such, according to Herodotus, is the Argives' own account ; and the reader will find on reference that no mention is made in it of the insurrection of the slaves, &c. &c. Let us therefore, for consistency's sake, take the account given by the other Greeks. According to them, the Argives were in alliance with Xerxes : nay, it was even reported that the Argives invited the Persians into Greece, that they might be revenged on the Lacedæmonians.¹ We will merely infer from this, that when Egina acknowledged her vassalage to Darius by the delivery of earth and water, Argos followed the example, not of Athens and Sparta, but of Egina and other states. Now, however, Egina was active in preparations for a resistance which might be deemed rebellious by Xerxes : Athens was said to be the great object of his resentment ; and Sparta, as well as Athens, had treated the Persian heralds with barbarian inhumanity. If success should attend the immense army and navy of Xerxes ; if he should be able to "cry havoc and let slip the dogs of war" on these states ; how could Argos, which was now claiming an equal share in the chief command, hope to escape destruction ?

What then was the motive which had such power with the rulers of Argos ? The pride of antient pre-eminence. Herodotus does not tell us so. The Argives, says he, according to their own account, stipulated for a share in the chief command, because they anticipated a refusal, and the refusal would furnish them with a good excuse for declining to join the confederacy. But let us see how Mitford proves that Argos ever possess this antient superiority. Prize Greek puzzles us, but oracular Greek was meant to puzzle the Greeks themselves. Luckily, however, Mitford does not lay much stress upon the oracle. As far as it can be understood, it defends the antient pretension of the Argians to superiority over all other Grecian states ; but then he tells us, that it was evidently composed by a friend to the Argians : and we find that when Delphi was about to be attacked, the Delphians sent their wives and children into Achaia, and not to Argos,

1

"mad to wreak

His vengeance——

——on the Moors he call'd ;

A countless multitude they came."—RODERICK.

although Achaia was in the Persian interest. Such being the case, the oracular compliment, "Dear to the immortal gods," may be reduced to the level of other compliments, and the part that is not to be understood may merit the praise which was seriously bestowed on some of Akenside's poetry, i. e. that it was at once enchanting and unintelligible; but it is not worth a great deal as evidence: so we will make further enquiry. Sicyon is said to have been founded long before Argos. Mitford inclines to Sir Isaac Newton's conjecture, that Sicyon and Argos may have been founded nearly together; but this will hardly prove the greater antiquity of Argos. "A passage of the poet Æschylus concerning the Pelasgi, for its antiquity, its evident honesty, its probability, its consistency with all other remaining evidence of best authority, appears to deserve particular notice. The Pelasgian princes, he says, extended their dominion over all the northern parts of Greece, together with Macedonia and Epirus, as far as the river Strymon eastward, and the sea beyond the Dodonæan mountains westward. Peloponnesus was not peopled so early; for Apis, apparently a Pelasgian chief, crossing the Corinthian gulph from Ætolia, and destroying the wild beasts, first made that peninsula securely habitable for men; and hence it had from him its most antient name of Apia.¹"

Notwithstanding the quaker-like plainness of his literary garb, Mitford may be somewhat of a grave wag at bottom. The passage, so admirable in so many respects, occurs in the Danaides, or Female Suppliants; and the speaker is Pelasgus, or at any rate a Pelasgian, the king of Argolis, and of the countries specified by Mitford. The scene is laid in Argolis; and the Pelasgians, so called from their king, are in possession of the land. The land, or to use the expression of the speaker, *this* land, may mean all Peloponnesus; but it is said by him to have been called Apia, from a son of Apollo, who was a physician and a prophet, and who cleared it of its dragon-brood. The speaker is himself the actual and reigning king of the extensive dominions; he speaks of the name as an antient name; and he speaks of the person from whom the land was called Apia, not as a Pelasgian chief, nor as one who was to flourish in future times, nor as a destroyer of wild beasts in general; but as a son of Apollo, who took after his father in the double capacity of prophet and physician; who, though duly remembered, was dead and gone, and whose exterminating offices he limits to the

δρακονθόμιλον δυσμενῇ ξυνοικίαν.

"Danaus," says Mitford in another place, "landed near Argos, where Gelanor was then reigning." He was received by the rude

¹ Mitford, vol. i. c.1. s. 2.

inhabitants with extraordinary favor—taught them to dig wells, and soon obtained the kingdom: and he observes of the circumstances of these and similar stories, that “they are the only memorials remaining to characterize those early ages.” If the reader will compare the story of the arrival of Danaus as given by Æschylus, with the story just alluded to, which Mitford details at some length, he will find that the Argive king, to whom Æschylus gives such extensive dominions, must be the same as the Gelanor of the other story; and he may then endeavour to reconcile the antiquity, evident honesty, probability, &c. of the account given by Æschylus with the “only memorials remaining to characterize those early ages.” We are told, moreover, that “such was the prevalence of the power and fame of Danaus in Peloponnesus, that, according to Euripides, the people of that peninsula, before called Pelasgians, received from him the name of Danaäns, which remained to Homer’s age.” Homer’s authority would have been more satisfactory than that of Euripides, even if Euripides had made the assertion; for as Homer is much the more antient of the two, there would be an awkwardness in our supposing that he knew any thing of what Euripides had said. Euripides, however, uses the word Hellas, and not Peloponnesus; and as this would involve us in another discussion, we will proceed in hopes of faring better.

Eurystheus was powerful enough to persecute Hercules and his offspring: this promises well; but, unfortunately, Pelops, who had established his influence throughout the peninsula, had left a son, Atreus by name, who was not likely to acknowledge the superiority of his nephew Eurystheus; and a recollection of the Nemean lion and Lernæan hydra, will be sufficient to shew that if Apis did destroy the wild beasts, the security of habitation which he effected was like that which Bardolph offered to the mercer—none of the safest. These monsters were destroyed by Hercules; but the adventurous journey of Theseus shews that even the might of Hercules had not given peace and prosperity to the kingdom of Eurystheus, nor made Argolis securely habitable for men. Agamemnon was the most powerful of all the Grecian princes. So far, so good: but was Agamemnon king of Argos? Homer says no. The chiefs of Argos, properly so called, were Diomed, Sthenelus, and Euryalus. Agamemnon was king of Mycenæ.¹ So we have

¹ How did Agamemnon get the many islands which he was king of? The question may be answered by looking into Southey’s *Thalaba*. “How came Mohareb to be sultan of this island? Every one who has read *Don Quixote* knows that there are always islands to be had by adventurers. He killed the former sultan, and reigned in his stead. What could not a Domdanielite perform? The narration would have interrupted the flow of the main story.” If Mohareb was a Domdaniel-

gone further, and fared worse ; for we were told before that, in the time of Xerxes, Mycenæ was independent of Argos, and sent eighty men to join the allies. Shall we question the authority of Homer ? We shall do Mitford no service. Whether wittingly or unwittingly, he has taken great liberties with sacred history.

It is evident that Ninus or Nineveh was the capital of the Assyrian empire ; and without going further than the 31st chapter of Ezekiel, we may learn that the Assyrian was " fair in his greatness, in the length of his branches, for his root was by great waters," and that under his shadow dwelt all great nations. Yet Mitford, in his scanty notice of Assyria, makes no mention of Nineveh, but expresses himself so as to lead the incautious reader to imagine that the Assyrian and Babylonian empires were one and the same.¹ We must allow that there would be an absurdity in asserting with the divine Plato that the Trojan kingdom formed part of the Assyrian empire, and that it was through confidence in the Assyrian power that the Trojans provoked the invasion of the Greeks. Had this been the case, the Assyrian would soon have overwhelmed the Greeks. But is Mitford right in omitting altogether what even a heathen writer was forced to notice ? If the wide and absolute rule of Nineveh is incompatible with the war of Troy, is Mitford justified in attempting to give credibility to the latter by taking little or no notice of the former ? Tyre is represented by Mitford as the first maritime power in the world, about fifty years after it had been subdued by Nabuchodonosor king of Assyria ; so that this pre-eminence of Tyre got the start of her restoration by about twenty years ; for the Tyrians or Heraclidæ were seventy years in exile.² After the fall of Tyre, Egypt was desolated by Nabu-

ite, Agamemnon was dear to Jupiter ; and Homer's main story would have stopt still, if he had entered into particulars. But where shall we place these many islands ? Thucydides, who has told us more truth than we had any reason to expect, says, that the islands near Argolis were not many. A little work of Garrick's will help us out of our difficulty :—

KITTY.—" Pray, Sharp, where does your master's estate lie ?"

SHARP.—" Lie ! lie ! why it lies—faith, I can't name any particular place ; it lies in so many. His effects are divided ; some here, some there : his steward hardly knows himself."

KITTY.—" Scattered, scattered, I suppose."

¹ See c. 1. s. 1. and c. 6. s. 1.

² We may learn from Arrian, Ex. Al. lib. ii. that the Tyrian Hercules was older than the Grecian Hercules ; and if we want to know why Hercules was sold, and took to the distaff, we should call to mind that Tyre was famous for its manufactures, and that Tyrians were sold to the Sabeans.

" Tyre, after an obstinate defence, was captured by the Babylonians ; but not before the citizens had removed their effects to a neighbouring island, where a new city was built." (Outline of General History, part i.

chodonosor, and lay desolate for forty years. This does not agree well with Mitford's account of Egypt. Babylon was ruined by the Medes. This does not agree well with Mitford's account of Babylon; but it is justice to add, that almost all our commentators and historians have chosen to correct Scripture by profane history. Until the conquests of Alexander, conquests which have been ludicrously exaggerated in their extent and importance, Persia "pushed westward, and northward, and southward," and overpowered all resistance. This does not agree well with Mitford's account of Persia. If then, in addition to these variations of the original harmony, we set Mitford at variance with Homer, we shall do him no service. It will be better to conclude, though without knowing why, that this antient pre-eminence and the pride of it are matters of fact, and to proceed accordingly.¹

"The Argians were, according to Herodotus, so thoroughly in the Persian interest, that they had undertaken to intercept any Spartan troops that should attempt to quit Laconia." So says Mitford, in the section which contains the campaign in Bœotia and battle of Plataea, and which therefore brings us back to Mar-donius and his army. But was not the undertaking of the Argians very strange? How could the pride of antient pre-eminence enable them in their weak state to intercept the 50,000 troops of Sparta?

"To exalt causes into agents, to invest abstract ideas with form and animate them with activity, has always been the right of poetry."² True; but Herodotus is the father and prince of history, of grave prose. So we must make further enquiry into this undertaking, and also into some other little matters which are connected with the very wonderful campaign in Bœotia and battle of Plataea.

p. 19.) If Bonaparte had desolated England, and burnt London, would our merchants have thought themselves safe in the Isle of Dogs? Nebuchadnezzar was not a man to be bearded.

"Nebuchadnezzar next attacked Egypt, then distracted by civil wars, and totally subdued it. The conquest, however, does not appear to have been permanent." (Ibid.) From that conquest to the present hour, Egypt has not been governed by native princes, but has truly been the basest of the kingdoms.

¹ Moab was very proud, and the remnant of Moab feeble. From Ar of Moab we may derive the Greek *Ἄρης*, our own *War*, the French *Guerre*, and the Latin forms *Gra-Divus* and *Graii*. In Heres, or Kir-Heres of Moab, we may trace Ceres, and the real cause of her wanderings.

² See Johnson's remarks on Milton's Allegories.

ON THE MYSTERIES OF ELEUSIS.

A LEARNED Platonist of our own time, Mr. T. Taylor, in a "Dissertation on the Eleusinian Mysteries," has attempted to prove that they were intended to teach allegorically the Platonic philosophy. Pray does Mr. T. suppose that they originated amongst the Platonists? They were certainly neither of Platonic nor of Orphic invention. Although we are uncertain whether they were introduced into Greece by Melampus,¹ or by Orpheus,² or by Eumolpus,³ or by the daughters of Danaus;⁴ yet it is generally agreed that they came thither from Egypt. Their original import was lost in their migration; and it is highly probable that at the time when they were transported to Greece, the Egyptians themselves had lost the knowledge of their meaning.

The more ancient of the Greeks, Pausanias tells us, considered the Mysteries of Eleusis as exceeding in sanctity all other sacred rites, as much as the immortal gods were superior to the heroes.⁵ Diodorus Siculus says that they were celebrated over the whole world on account of their great antiquity and purity.⁶ And Cicero observes of Ceres, or Demeter, one of the Eleusinian triad, that she was exceedingly ancient and sacred, and the origin and chief of all sacred rites amongst every people and nation.⁷ And the writer of the Homeric Hymn to Ceres,

¹ Μελαμποδα δε τον Αμυθαονος αλλοι φασιν εξ Αιγυπτου μετακομισαι τη 'Ελλάδι τας Δηους Ιορτας, πενθος ὕμνουμενον. Clemens Alexandrin. Protrept. p. 10.—Herodotus says the same thing, lib. ii. p. 122.

² Ορφεα μεν γαρ των μυστικων τελετων τα πλειστα και τα περι την ἑαυτου πλαττην οργιαζομενα, και την εν ἄδου μυθοποιαν απενεγκασθαι, κ. τ. λ. Diodorus Siculus, lib. i. p. 107. Πρωτος Ορφευς μυστηρια θεων παραδεδωκεν. Schol. in Eurip. Alcest. and Pausanias (in Laconicis) says, Δημητρη δε Χθονιαν Λακεδαιμονιοι μεν σεβειν φασι, παραδοντος σφισιν Ορφευς.

³ Εμολπος δ Μουσαιου τα μυστηρια ανεφηνεν εν Ελευσινι. Marmor Oxoniens. p. 23.

⁴ Αί Δαναου θυγατερες ησαν, αί την τελετην ταυτην [την θεσμοφοριαν Δημητρος] εξ Αιγυπτου εξαγαγουσαι, και διδασσαι τας Πελασγιωτιδας γυναικας. Herodotus, lib. ii. p. 176.

⁵ Οί γαρ αρχαιωτεροι των 'Ελληνων τελετην την Ελευσινιαν πατων, ὅποσα ες ευσεβειαν ἦκει, τοσούτῃ πῶον εντιμωτεραν, ὅσῃ και θεους επικροσθεν ἥρων. Pausan. Phocica, lib. x. c. 31.

⁶ Και τοις εν Ελευσινι μυστηριοις, ἃ δια την ὑπερβολην της αρχαιοτητος και ἄγνειας εγενοντο πασιν ἀνθρωποις περιβοητα. Diod. Sic. lib. v. p. 333.

⁷ Hoc dico, hanc ipsam Cererem, antiquissimam, religiosissimam, principem omnium sacrorum, quæ apud omnis gentes, nationesque sunt, a C. Verre ex suis templis ac sedibus esse sublatam. Cicero, Orat. in Verrem.—And thus Apuleius, —Eleusiniæ vetustam deam Cererem. Metamorph. lib. xi.

represents those who had been initiated as peculiarly happy, in comparison with the uninitiated who were ignorant and covered with darkness :

Ολβιος, ὃς ταδ' ὁπωπεν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων·

Ὅς δ' ἀτελής, ἰερῶν ὃς τ' ἀμμορός, οὐποθ' ὁμοίων·

Λίσαν ἔχει, φθιμένος περ, ὑποζώφῃ εὐραυνετι.¹

Thus also Seneca represents these mystic rites as attended by vast crowds of people :

Turba secretam Cererem frequentat,

Et citi tectis properant relictis

Attici noctem celebrare Mystæ.²

We may judge, therefore, that they must have been intended to represent some very important event, something more than Platonical allegories. My readers may perhaps start, if I tell them that it was intended to preserve the remembrance of the most important of all events, of the fall of man, as the origin of the changing destinies of the human race. But when they have read the following observations, they may form their own conclusions.

The lesser mysteries have little to do with my subject. They were but supplementary to the others. It appears from Diodorus, that they were brought along with the other mysteries from Egypt.³ They taught the notion of a future state of reward and punishment, consequent on the events that were commemorated in the greater. They taught that death was the lot of all; that—

——— facilis descensus Averni :

Noctes atque dies patet atri janua Ditis :

Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad auras,

Hoc opus, hic labor est.

Virgil, *Æn.* vi. 126.

They pictured to the minds of the people the dreadful tribunal and administrator of judgment after death, the fate of the wicked, their punishment in the gloomy and comfortless realms of Tartarus :—

Gnossius hæc Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna,

Castigatque, auditque dolos : subigitque fateri

Quæ quis apud superos, furto lætatus inani,

¹ Homer, *Hymn. eis Ἀθημίτῃρα*, v. 406.

² Seneca, *Herod. Furens*, act. iii. Thus Cicero :—"Omitto Eleusinam sanctam illam et augustam ubi initiantur gentes orarum ultimæ."—Cic. de Nat. Deor. lib. i. p. 294.

³ Diodorus Siculus, lib. i. p. 107, *supra citat.*

Distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem.
 Continuo sontes ultrix accincta flagello
 Tisiphone quatit insultans, torvosque sinistra
 Intentans angues, vocat agmina sæva sororum.
 Tum demum horrissono stridentes cardine sacræ
 Panduntur portæ. Cernis, custodia qualis
 Vestibulo sedeat? facies quæ limina servet? &c.

Virg. *Æn.* vi. 566.

————— Ne quære doceri
 Quam pœnam, aut quæ forma viros fortunave mersit.
 Saxum ingens volvunt alii, radiisque rotarum
 Districti pendent: sedet, æternumque sedebit
 Infelix Theseus; Phlegyasque miserrimus omnes
 Admonet, et magna testatur voce per umbras:
 Discite justitiam moniti, et non temnere Divos.
 Vendidit hic auro patriam, dominumque potentem
 Imposuit: fixit leges pretio atque refixit.
 Hic thalamum invasit natæ, vetitosque hymenæos:
 Ausi omnes immane nefas, ausoque potiti.
 Non, mihi si linguæ centum sint, oraque centum,
 Ferrea vox, omnes scelerum comprehendere formas,
 Omnia pœnarum percurrere nomina possim.

Æn. vi. 614.

Next were exhibited the joyous realms of the real Paradise,
 the happy fields and pleasant groves:—

Devenere locos lætos, et amœna vireta
 Fortunatorum nemorum, sedesque beatas.
 Largior hic campos æther et lumine vestit
 Purpureo; solemque suum, sua sidera nôrunt.

Æn. vi. 638.

As well as the occupations of the blessed, now at length freed
 from the fetters of mortality:—

Pars in gramineis exercent membra palæstris;
 Contendunt ludo, et fulva luctantur arena:
 Pars pedibus plaudunt choreas, et carmina dicunt.
 Necnon Threïcius longa cum veste sacerdos
 Obloquitur numeris septem discrimina vocum:
 Jamque eadem digitis, jam pectine pulsat eburno.
 Hic genus antiquum Teucris, pulcherrima proles,
 Magnanimi heroes, nati melioribus annis:
 Illosque, Assaracusque, et Trojæ Dardanus auctor:
 Arma procul, currusque virûm miratur inanes.
 Stant terra defixæ hastæ, passimque soluti
 Per campos pascuntur equi. Quæ gratia currûm

Armorumque ~~sunt~~ vivis, quæ cura nitentes
Pascere equos, eadem ~~sequitur~~ tellure repóstos.
Conspicit, ecce, alios dextra ~~lauraque~~ per herbam
Vescentes, lætumque choro ~~Pæana canentes~~,
Inter odoratum lauri nemus : unde superne
Plurimus Eridani per sylvam volvitur amnis.

Æn. vi. 642.

The greater mysteries consisted in representing what formed in the popular mythology the fable of the rape of Proserpine.¹ And as some of the shows of the lesser mysteries² have been described poetically by Virgil, so the less arcane parts of the shows of the greater have formed the subject of a poetical work by Claudian. The poet himself refers distinctly to the source from whence he took his story at its commencement. He introduces the very expression of the mystics—"Hence, ye profane!"³ and speaks of the religious fury and astonishment with which he is inspired, as though he were present at its mysterious representation :

gressus removete, profani !

Jam furor humanos nostro de pectore sensus
Expulit, et totum spirant præcordia Phœbum.
Jam mihi cernuntur trepidis delubra moveri
Sedibus, et claram dispergere culmina lucem,
Adventum testata Dei ; jam magnus ab imis
Auditur fremitus terris, templumque remugit
Cecropium, sanctasque faces attollit Eleusin.
Angues Triptolemi stridunt, et squamea curvis
Colla levant attrita jugis, lapsuque sereno
Erecti roseas tendunt ad carmina cristas.
Ecce procul ternas Hecate variata figuras
Exoritur, lenisque simul procedit Iacchus
Crinali florens edera, quem Parthica velat

¹ Δῶδε καὶ Κορὴν, δράμα ἤδη ἐγενεσθὲν μυστικὸν καὶ τὴν πλῆλιν, καὶ τὴν ἄρπαιγν, καὶ τὸ πένθος αὐταὶν Ἐλευσίσι δαδουχεῖ. Clem. Alex. Protrept. p. 9.— See also Lactantius, Arnobius, and D. Augustinus, de Civ. Dei, lib. vii. c. 20.

² The sacred pledges that were supposed to be connected with the fate of Messene, and which were so carefully preserved by the brave Aristomenes, consisted of thin plates of lead, rolled up in the form of a volume, and contained the history and worship of Ceres and Proserpine.

³ Ἐκας, ἕκας, ὅστις ἀλιτρός, and Ἐκας, ἕκας, ἐστὶ βεβηλὸν.—Βεβαλοῖς τὰ ταινῶν Ἐλευσινικῶν θεῶν μυστήρια οὐ διηγέσθαι. Lysis Pythagoreus.—Thus Orpheus, φθεγγόμεναι οἷς θεμὺς ἐστὶ, θυρὰς ἐπίβησθε βεβηλοῖς.

Virgil, too, intimates the source of the narrative in his sixth book, by the expression—"Procul, o procul este, profani !" Æn. vi. 258. "Profani, qui non estis initiati," says Servius, in loc.

Tigris, et auratos in nodum colligit ungues.

Ebria Mæonius firmat vestigia thyrsus.

Claudian. de Rapt. Proserp. i. 4.

The two principal Eleusinian deities, Ceres or Demeter, and Proserpine, were, according to Pausanias, styled pre-eminently by the people of Messenia the *Great Goddesses* (αἱ Μεγαλαί Θεαί).¹ Ceres, according to Cicero, (*supra cit.*) was the most ancient and most sacred of the deities. She was the same as the *Terra Mater*, the all-productive Earth (Γῆ).² She was the Egyptian Isis,³ who was also in one sense symbolical of the earth.⁴

¹ Το δὲ ἕτερον περὶ τῆς στοᾶς παρεχεται το πρὸς ἡλίον ὁρῶν περιβολὸν Θεῶν ἱερὸν τῶν Μεγαλῶν αἱ δὲ εἰσι αἱ Μεγαλαί Θεαί Δημήτηρ καὶ Κερή, καθότι ἐδήλωσα ἤδη καὶ ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ συγγράφῃ. Pausan. Arcadica, lib. viii. c. 31. sub init.

² Τῇ δὲ γῇ ὥσπερ ἐγγεῖν τι τῶν φεομένων ἐπολαμβάνοντες, μήτερα προσεγορεύσαι. καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας δὲ ταύτην παρεκλήσεις Δημήτερα καλεῶν, βραχὺ μετετεθείσης δια τὸν χρόνον τῆς λείξεως. το γὰρ παλαιοὶ νομοῖσθαι γῆν μήτερα καθάπερ καὶ τὸν Ὀρφεα προσμαρτυρεῖν, λεγόντα, Γῆ μήτηρ πάντων Δημήτηρ κλοντοδοτεῖρα. Diod. Sic. lib. i. p. 16.—Μήτηρ δ' ὡς εἰκε καὶ ἡ γῆ, παρ' ὃ καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις εἶδεν αὐτὴν Δημήτραν καλεῖσαι, τὸ μήτρος καὶ γῆς ὄνομα συνθεῖσιν. Philo Judæus, de Mund. Opif. p. 30 c.—Διὰ δὲ τὸ μήτρος τρόπον φνεῖν τε καὶ τρεφεῖν πάντα, Δημήτραν, οἶονε γῆς μήτραν οὖσαν. Phurnutus de Nat. Deor. p. 74.—Δημήτηρ ἡ γῆ. οἶονε γῆν μήτηρ τις οὖσα. Suidas in Δημήτηρ.—Ὡς περ καὶ τὸ Δημήτηρ, ὃ ἐστὶ γῆ μήτηρ ἀλληγορικῶς. Eustath. in Il. I. p. 762. vol. ii.—Δημήτηρ μὲν, ἡ γῆ καλεῖται, ὅτι πάντων ἡ γῆ μήτηρ. Villosion, Anecdota Græc. vol. i. p. 109.—And again: Περὶ τῆς Δημήτρος ἐτι καὶ Ἑστίας ἀμφοτέρων λεκτέον ἑκάτερα δ' εἰκεν οὐχ ἕτερα τῆς γῆς εἶναι. p. 110.—Τὴν γὰρ γῆν, ἀφ' ἧς οἱ καρποὶ πάντες, Δημήτραν νομοῖσθαι οἱ παλαιοί. Proclus in Hesiod. Erg. A.—Δημήτηρ γὰρ ἡ γῆ, Δωρικῶς. Tzetzes in Hesiod. ibid.—Δημήτηρ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ γῆ. Schol. in Hesiod. Theogon.—Thus also Lucretius, lib. v. 818.

Quare etiam atque etiam maternum nomen adeptæ

Terra tenet merito, quoniam genus ipsa creavit

Humanum, atque animal prope certo tempore fudit

Omne.

Thus Orpheus,

Γαῖα θεά, μήτηρ μακαρῶν, θνητῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων,
Πατρόφε, παύδατ' εἰρα, τελεσφορε, παρταλετ' εἰρα.

Hymn. xxxi. Γῆς θυμῆμα.

And thus there was at Mount Prone a Δημήτηρ Χθονία. Pausan. Corinthiaca, c. xxxv.—Montfaucon has a remarkable figure of Ceres in this character, which he supposes to be modern. He gives it, on the authority of Ottavio Rossi and Lamberti, from a Ms. of the Biblioth. Cæsar. No. xxxv. "C'est," says Montfaucon, "une femme nue qui tient le globe de la terre sur son giron; elle a de longs cheveux épars et flottans sur ses épaules; elle fait couler le lait de ses mamelles sur ce globe, ce qui marque la mère nature qui nourrit toute la terre en produisant des fruits pour l'entretien des hommes et de tous les animaux." Pl. xxix. fig. 5. tom. i. Suppl.

³ Δημήτηρ δὲ Ἰσις. Herod. lib. ii. p. 171.—Τὸν δὲ, Ἰσὺ ἐγγίστα πῶς Δημήτραν. Diod. Sic. lib. i. p. 17.—Ἰσις δ' ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλῶσσαν ἡ Δημήτηρ. Stephanus Byzant. in Βουσιρῖς.—Λέων δὲ, ὃ τὰ περὶ τῶν κατ' Αἰγύπτου θεῶν πραγμάτων εἰσαφέροντος, τὴν Ἰσὺν ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων Δημήτραν καλεῖσθαι φησιν. Clemens Alexand. Strom. lib. i. p. 322.—Ἰσιδος—καὶ Δημήτρος καλουμένης. Tzetzes in Hes. Erg. A. p. 18.

⁴ Ἰσις—ἡ αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶ τῇ γῇ. Etymolog. Mag. in verbum.—"Isis autem lingua Ægyptiorum est terra, quam Isim volunt esse." Servius in Æn. viii. "Huic parvas est collis sensim supinus, declinans ad mare, nominatus Baccha Isidis mo-

In this sense Ceres is represented as being a great benefactress to mankind, as producing fruit and corn.¹ Hence her Roman name Ceres is said to be derived.²

[To be continued.]

THE PUPIL'S
METRICAL COMPANION TO HOMER;

CONTAINING

AN EXPLANATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF
HOMER'S VERSIFICATION AND PROSODY;

AND A SOLUTION OF

ALL THE METRICAL DIFFICULTIES

OCCURRING IN

THE ILIAD AND ODYSSEY.

By HENRY W. WILLIAMS,

AUTHOR OF "A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE VERSIFICATION
AND PROSODIAL USAGES OF THE ILIAD AND ODYSSEY," &c.

THE versification of the Iliad and Odyssey is a subject with which every one who studies those poems should be in some degree conversant, since it is impossible to form proper ideas of their merits, unless a proper reference be had to their metrical structure. At the same time, it is a subject encumbered with difficulties the most formidable, and apparently involved in inconsistencies the most glaring and unjustifiable; so that if the attention of the juvenile student be directed to it without some especial guide, his exertions will probably be unsuccessful in their issue, and disheartening in their effects. These considerations have led to the composition of the present work; the object of which is, to display fully and clearly to the pupil the principles and regulations of Homer's versification and prosody,

tris deorum." Dionysius Byzant. de Thracio Bosphoro, p. 11. ap. Geog. Gr. Min. tom. iii.

¹ Virgil. Georg. lib. i. where Servius observes—"Prima Ceres omne genus agriculturæ hominibus indicavit."

Prima Ceres unco glebas dimovit aratro;

Prima dedit fruges, alimenta que mitia terris;

Prima dedit leges; Ceresi sunt omnia munus.

Ovid. Metam. lib. v. fab. 6.

See Diodorus Sic. lib. i. p. 17.

² Ceres a creando dicta. Servius in Virg. Georg. i. v. 7.

and to assist him in removing those metrical difficulties which he will meet with in a careful perusal of the Homeric writings. Of the necessity of such a work, as resulting from the nature and character of treatises already existing, the author will not here speak; neither is it his design to notice particularly any of the peculiar opinions advanced in this volume. Most, if not all, of these have been previously stated, illustrated, and defended in a treatise entitled, "A Critical Investigation of the Versification and Prosodial Usages of the Iliad and Odyssey; with a view to the general Restoration of the Homeric Readings; embracing some original Theories relative to the primitive Orthography of the Poems:"¹ to which the advanced philologist is respectfully referred. As it regards the execution of the present performance, its merit or demerit must be left to the decision of others: it may not, however, be improper in the writer to say, that brevity, clearness, and force, have been studied in the diction; perspicuity and simplicity in the general arrangement; fidelity and accuracy in the statement of particulars; together with moderation and candor in the expression of individual judgment; and that he trusts, however far the work may be removed from perfection, that no gross departure from these principles is discernible in it.

Bristol, 8th January, 1829.

PART I.—Containing, *An Explanation of the Principles of Homer's Versification and Prosody.*

CHAPTER 1.—Of Quantity, Accent, Emphasis, Tones, and Pauses, viewed generally; and of the Nature and Construction of the Ancient Greek Hexameters.

Recitation, like every thing else in nature, has its characteristic properties; some being derived from the essential properties of a simple note of speech, and others naturally resulting from the combination of several words in a sentence, and of several sentences in a paragraph. To the former class belong *quantity* and *accent*; to the latter, *emphasis*, *tones*, and *pauses*: which properties we shall endeavor to explain in order.

1. *Quantity* relates to the time occupied in the pronunciation of syllables, as being long or short. In other words, the *quantity* of a syllable is its length, as measured by the time employed in uttering it. Hence it is easy to perceive that there must be an extensive diversity in the quantity of the various syllables, since there evidently exists an extensive diversity in the time required for their pronunciation. There are, however, only two general distinctions of syllables in respect of quantity; long marked thus —, and short thus ∪; and although many syllables of the former class are longer than others, and many syllables of the latter are shorter than others, yet every long and every short syllable is, for most purposes of prosody and metre, precisely equivalent to another.

¹ London, 8vo. pp. 88. Pr. 4s. 6d. Simpkin and Marshall, 1828.

2. *Accent*, or, as it has been termed by some, *syllabic emphasis*, is a stress of the voice, comprising both loudness and acuteness, laid on a particular syllable of every word, except a few short unimportant ones, termed by the Greeks *enclitics*. There are commonly said to be three accents, the *acute*, the *grave*, and the *circumflex*: these terms, however, are to be understood solely in reference to the marks employed to denote the accent, and are not to be considered as designating any varieties in the nature of the accent itself. Syllabic emphasis is of great importance to recitation; since it enables the ear rightly to distinguish the several words of a sentence, and also produces an agreeable variety in the utterance. It was not, however, esteemed by the Greeks and Romans of equal importance with quantity; so that in the composition of their poetry, they paid an almost exclusive attention to the length of the syllables employed, and scrupled not to alter the position of the accent, from a certain syllable of every word to a certain syllable of every foot. And hence we have the two kinds of accent, *prosaic* and *metrical*, differing from each other not in their nature, but only in their position: that of the former being determined by the proper and peculiar character of every word, and that of the latter being regulated by the nature of the metre, as being iambic, trochaic, anapaestic, dactylic, &c. In writing poetry, the marks of the prosaic accent are continued, and are often of service in exhibiting the true signification of the words: in reciting poetry, however, the metrical accent alone is to be followed. The subservience of syllabic emphasis to quantity in the Greek and Latin languages, affords a remarkable instance of the difference between the prosody of those languages and that of the English. To our tongue, accent is of the same consequence as quantity was to those; and although the length of syllables is not disregarded by us, yet as far as our versification is concerned, it gives place to its more influential neighbour.

3. *Emphasis*, as applied to words, is a peculiar intension or stress of the voice laid on them, in order to give them force and prominence. It serves to add life and vigor to the discourse, and is indispensable to animated pronunciation.

4. *Tones* are peculiar modulations of the voice, by means of which the speaker is enabled to display his full meaning, in all its niceness and in all its variety.

5. *Pauses* are temporary suspensions of the voice, without which utterance could not long proceed. They may be distributed into two classes, *sentential* and *vocal*: the former being employed to distinguish the several members of a sentence, and the latter to mark, generally speaking, the termination of an important word. The sentential pauses of the Greeks were the comma, the colon, the period, and the note of interrogation, besides a few extraordinary ones occasionally introduced: respecting these, as being invariably marked in Greek works, no difficulty can occur to the pupil. The vocal pauses were very slight suspensions of the voice, and scarcely perceptible to the hearer, unless particularly attentive to the recitation: they were made in prose of a dignified kind, and requiring to be recited deliberately, at the termination of every important word, not intimately connected in meaning with the one following. These pauses are essential to, and necessarily produce deliberate utterance; consequently, in all lighter species of composition, they cannot be properly employed. In poetry of a dignified and weighty character, particularly the epic and the tragic, it should appear that the vocal pauses were employed to distinguish the feet or dipodes, as well as to mark, when it could be done with consistency, the termination of an important word; and accordingly we may style them, as being under the direction of the metre, *metrical pauses*. It may be proper to add, that on the subject of the occurrence of the metrical pauses, much must be left to individual judgment.

To proceed to a consideration of the verses constituting the Iliad and the Odyssey,—we remark that they are of the kind denominated *dactylic hexameters*, each containing six feet, or “metres.” Of these feet the first four are *dactyls*— $\cup \cup$, or *spondees*— — , indiscriminately; the fifth is usually a dactyl, and the last a spondee; as in the subjoined lines:

Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεῶα, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος

Οὐλομένην, ἣ μὲρ Ἀχαιοὶς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,

Πάλλας δ' ἰφθιμοῦς ψυχὰς Ἀϊδί προΐειπεν

Ἥραων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλωρῶ τευχῆ κύνεσσιν

Οἰωνοῖσι τὲ πᾶσι· Δῖος δ' ἐτέλειέ το' βοῦλῃ·

Ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτὰ διὰ στήθεσσι κύνεσσιν

Ἀτρεΐδης τὲ, ὡς αὖξ ἀνδρῶν, καὶ Δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.—Π. A. 1—7.

Occasionally a spondee is introduced as the fifth foot ;

Π. A. 11.—Οὐνέκ' τῶν Χρυσῆν ἥτιμῃσ' ἀρήτηρα.

14.—Στεῖμα τ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν ἐκὶ βάλου Ἀπώλλωνος.

It is to be observed, that in dactylic hexameters a short syllable at the end of a line is, for all purposes of versification, equivalent to a long one.

In the course of the Homeric poems, instances of other feet besides the two mentioned above, are occasionally to be found : this circumstance, however, is not sufficient to warrant us in receiving the feet alluded to as admissible in Greek hexameters. Many of the verses in question have been corrupted by errors of transcription ; and in others the anomaly is only apparent, since the usages they exhibit can be explained without involving the introduction of improper feet. On this subject the reader will meet with further information in other portions of this treatise, and particularly in the second part.

As to the *recitation of Homer's verses*, it scarcely admits of a doubt, that the first syllable of every foot received the metrical accent, or "ictus metricus ;" that of the dactyl, agreeably to the general rule for the accentuation of feet, which assigns the accent to the long syllable of the foot ; and that of the spondee, as being associated with the dactyl. Accordingly we must accent the annexed lines in the manner specified :

Μῆνιν ἀείδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος

Οὐλομένην, ἣ μὲρ Ἀχαιοὶς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,

Πάλλας δ' ἰφθιμοῦς ψυχὰς Ἀϊδί προΐειπεν.—Π. A. 1—3.

It also appears that a slight metrical pause was made after every foot, but that when the foot terminated with a word important in itself, and not intimately connected in meaning with the one following, the pause was rather longer than the common vocal pause. Likewise, to give a variety to the verse, and to mark the termination of important words as much as might be, the shorter metrical pause seems to have been made after the first syllable of a foot, when it was the final syllable of a word, of consequence in itself, and not closely connected with the succeeding one. To this pause, as occurring in the cæsuræ, the appellation of "cæsural" is usually applied. At the same time that the syllabic emphasis and the vocal pauses were thus under the direction of the metre, the emphasis on words, the tones, and the sentential pauses, must have been employed in behalf of the sense : so that not only was the true metrical character of every line fully conveyed to an attentive ear, but the meaning, in all its fulness and delicacy, was justly and forcibly expressed.

ON THE EPIC POETRY OF THE ROMANS.

OUR age, among its manifold changes, has witnessed the subversion of an old, and the establishment of a new system of criticism. It is true that the progress of this revolution has been various in various countries. While in one the new principles, after a long struggle with prevailing prejudice, and a long conflict of intellect, have obtained a final and decided predominance, are embodied in elaborate codes, and recognised in general practice; while in another the contest is still only beginning, and carried on with the vigor and eagerness of reformers on the one hand, and alarmed defenders of established notions on the other; the stage of opinion at which our own country has arrived, appears to be an intermediate one between the two. Our reverence for the "rules" has indeed been grievously shaken, partly by the splendid success of a few great poets,—success obtained by adherence to a very different system; and partly by a few scattered but masterly pieces of critical writing, which, though productive of little immediate effect, have gradually, in their results, leavened the whole mass of modern criticism. On the other hand, our hereditary prejudices are far from wholly worn away; there has been no formal abolition of the ancient regime: we have no recognised authority to refer to; no man of genius, by devoting himself exclusively to this subject, has developed the laws of art in a full and perfect form. Even in the best of our reviews on these subjects, there is generally a want of preciseness, a vague aiming at truth, the expression of a certain blind feeling rather than the statement of clear principles; and as to the worse part, the writers for pay or for temporary reputation; those who wish rather to shine and to be read than to instruct and to be remembered;—all that can be said of them is, that amidst much flourish, much empiricism, and much mock-learning, there is in their writings a certain tinge, a coloring mixture, of good purpose and correct perception. It is not without a consciousness of our own extreme deficiencies that we speak thus of others: we own that if a few grains of truth can be extracted from the dross of various kinds with which we fear our own attempts in this way are overcharged, it is more than can reasonably be expected; nor shall we complain, if our better-judging readers should think fit to consign us to the same limbo to which we have adjudged the great body of our contemporaries. But a sense of our own faults should not prevent us from expressing, as it cannot prevent us from perceiving, how far astray our fellow-explorers have gone from the point which we all ought to have in view, and of which most of us have a more or less distant prospect.

That a great change has, however, taken place, can now be no longer questioned. The public mind is still, indeed, in a state of much confusion and fluctuation; the elements are still tossing and blending, like those of a partially subsiding chaos; but they are no longer what they were, and it is quite evident that they cannot be brought back to what they were. The new state of feeling and belief thus produced, has developed itself in various directions. Its most striking and prominent effect is the change which it has produced in our estimation of the great modern writers. The noblest achievements of genius are no longer regarded, as under the former system they almost invariably were, as *exceptions*—as matter of pardon rather than of praise, like victories gained contrary to orders. We no longer talk of “snatching a grace beyond the reach of art;” there is, if not a distinct acknowledgement, yet a perception, that there can be no grace, no beauty, without the limits of art, none in truth which is not created by art; and that enactments, of which the breach may be more meritorious than the observance, are not true laws, but mere mechanical rules. The love, the admiration, which our unsophisticated perceptions call up in us at the sight of excellence, are no longer chilled and constrained by a secret misgiving of their impropriety. Dante and Ariosto, Chaucer and Shakspeare, Rabelais and Cervantes, are no longer regarded as illustrious outlaws, but honored as legitimate fellow-citizens of the great ancients, and duly-elected leaders in the republic of literature.

Not merely, however, are the comparative merits of the ancients and the moderns otherwise estimated now than at a former period: we have likewise altered the relative position of the ancients among themselves. We might instance the different view which is now taken by the best critics, of what were formerly considered the absurdities and extravagances of Aristophanes; extravagances which only appear so to us, because our imaginations have been tamed down and made barren by a wrong training. But the most remarkable alteration of sentiment regards the Roman writers, and more especially the poets. There was a time when Grecian and Roman poetry were classed together as products of the same genus; when Virgil and Horace, and their contemporaries, were considered as members of the same family with their Grecian predecessors; as inferior, indeed, in vigor and richness of imagination, but as almost compensating for the defect by superior refinement and greater perfection of art. This is now no longer the case. We have been converted from words to things, from forms to substance, from sound to sense. With a few illustrious exceptions, who appear to have imbibed the *spirit* of Greece, these celebrated writers are now treated not as inferior in degree, but as differing in kind, from those with whom they were habitually associated. Their stateliness, their brilliancy of diction, and many

collateral merits, are cheerfully acknowledged; but their claim to the true poetic laurel is resolutely denied. The Roman epic, the Roman ode, and the Roman tragedy, are regarded as spurious classes of composition, formed by an elaborate imitation of the mere outward phenomena of those truly so called: artificial flowers, resembling the true one in shape, and possessing all the merits of outward symmetry and neatness, but unctionless, and without any inward principle of life.

It may be said that in this, as in all that we have said above, there is much exaggeration; that we are describing a change which is as yet only in progress; that our statement, in short, however applicable to German, is not true of English opinion. There is much justice in this. It is true that Eton and Westminster are still strong in us; that our hereditary worship of the Roman muse, our regard for even the modes and accidents of Latin poetry, and our reverence for its leading names, still counteract in a great measure the dictates of matured reason, and the lights of a truer criticism. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, without annihilating that power of early association, in which, genial as it is to our nature and beneficial in its general effects, so many errors find accidental support, where they would otherwise fall away through their own weakness? Nevertheless, here also, as in other matters, the work has begun; although, as usual in such cases, what in some is to be attributed to an intuitive sense of the truth, in others implies only a dim recognition of it, and in not a few is the result of mere imitation. Even now there are those—and persons vested with authority too—who not only deny the legitimate descent of Virgil from Homer, and of Horace from Pindar, but who, even among the Romans themselves, place Catullus far above Horace, and regard Lucretius, not Virgil, as the true "*princeps poetarum Romanorum*." We may therefore hope that if our speculations on the nature and value of Latin epic poetry, crude and hasty as we confess them to be, should be fortunate enough to find readers, they will be treated by some at least of those readers, not as literary heresies, but as imperfect representations of the truth.

What is an epic poem? The question is easily answered, if we take popular opinion and modern practice for our guides; if we search into the truth of things, not so easily. It appears to us that there are two kinds of epic poems, one genuine, the other illegitimate; one the natural result of a certain state of cultivation, and happy predisposing circumstances; the other an after-birth, the product of an over-refined state, originating from the endeavors of learned men in an unpoetical age to emulate the glory of their predecessors, by reconstructing, in a more elaborate and ornate manner, the outward form and circumstance of the old epic, long after the peculiar spirit, which had created and

given significance to those externals, was gone. In early ages—in ages of established, but still imperfect, civilisation—the current of the national intellect drives strongly towards poetry, from the absence of other channels which might divide and dissipate its newly-awakened energies. And it is no less in the course of things, that in such ages, the poetry chiefly, we may almost say exclusively cultivated, should be narrative poetry. Mankind are then quickly susceptible of impressions, but not reflective. They are not yet arrived at that state which a modern philosophical writer describes as the natural origin of the drama: “Unadorned narratives of facts, or simple lyrical effusions of feeling, can no longer appease the hunger of a more craving intellect. Man is no longer satisfied either with things as they are, or with himself as he is; he requires that there should be presented to him a picture of the double war, which he has now discovered to be perpetually carrying on; that between the human will and external nature and fate, and that between the good and evil principles within the human will itself.” As in the youth of individuals, so in that of nations, vivid pictures of human events and of external nature suffice to delight the imagination. The history, too, of such times, supplies abundance of the subjects best fitted for minstrelsy; it is simple, striking, full of rapid changes and pathetic events, calling forth the characters of individuals into undisguised display, and strongly awakening the passions of human nature. Hence the fancy of the bard pours itself forth on the subjects most interesting to his audience; the achievements of adventurous warriors in search of plunder, of a mistress, of a settlement, or of simple glory; the praises of a Hercules or a Theseus, a hero or a knight-errant, braving dangers and sufferings for the sake of public good; and other similar subjects, intermingled indeed with much supernatural fiction, but such as the opinions of the times render credible, and which is in fact little more than a translation into the language of poetry of the crude and half-unconscious philosophy of a simple age. These strains gradually become more complex in diction and rhythm; and a greater variety of adventures is embraced within the compass of a single lay. But of the further step—how the various songs relating to different parts of one and the same great story come to form themselves into an heroic poem, properly so called,—of this we shall say nothing; for our speculations on these subjects, and our acquaintance with early literary tradition, are both so scanty, as to preclude us from entering into such an investigation. Suffice it that such an operation does take place, and that some of the results of it still remain.

Whether, under similar circumstances, all nations are not equally poetical, may admit of a question; but that the actual growth of poetry has not been equally successful in all countries, will be universally allowed. Whatever may be attributed to the happy

climate of a country, to the lively temperament of its inhabitants, to the circumstances of its original colonisation, or to other causes, the fact is as remarkable as it is certain. No country, ancient or modern, has produced a second *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. But although these works remain, and perhaps will always remain, unrivalled in their class, they do not stand alone in that class. The Spanish *Cid*, the Teutonic *Nibelungen*, the Anglo-Saxon romance of *Beowulf* analysed in Mr. Conybeare's posthumous work, appear to have been formed more or less in the same manner. In our own times the *Fingal* and *Temora* of the Pseudo-Ossian, which once fascinated all Europe, and which even now have not wholly lost their popularity, were ingenious attempts at deluding the public, by getting up a mock-piece of antiquity of the same kind.

It is to Greece, however, that the above observations are exclusively directed, as it was on Grecian models that the Roman poets formed themselves. Epic poetry, thus originating, rose to early perfection, and continued to flourish through many ages; although of its productions, with the exception of the Homeric poems, nothing but a very few fragments remains. At length a new era ensued: the mind of man slowly, but surely, took its wonted course; arts, and sciences, and philosophy arose; the daily employments of individuals, their public relations, their habitual subjects of thought, became different; that which instructed and delighted them of old was no longer sufficient for instruction or delight. The constituent elements of heroic poetry (those of them we mean which are essential to the poetic mind, and not circumstantial or temporary) dispersed themselves, and entered into new forms. In the history of Herodotus, and even of Thucydides, in the drama of *Æschylus*, and still more of *Sophocles*, nay even in the lyrics of *Pindar*, we may trace much of what, in a former age, would have entered into the formation of a *Homer*. Thus the rhapsodes, like the minstrels of modern Europe, gradually lost their importance and their good repute, and at length finally died away; and of the ancient poems which had been preserved in writing, a great part would seem, even at this time, to have perished. Still, however, a few magnificent monuments reared their heads above the flood of change, preserved by their own transcendent excellence. The power of imagination and of language displayed in them, combined with the nationality of their subjects, and the great though not unmixed truths of morality and religion which they contained, gave a permanent interest to such parts of their contents as might otherwise have passed away into oblivion with other things accidental and evanescent. That they should retain the exclusive hold which they originally possessed, on the now ripened mind of Greece, was not to be expected or wished; but that they should wholly lose it, was not imaginable. Their influence indeed, and the estimation in which they were held, are evident in all the records of this period.

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

THERE is a beautiful passage in the Olynthiacs of Demosthenes, which appears to be ill explained by the many commentators who have written on it. The passage is this (Ol. 2. according to the arrangement of Dion. Halicarnass.):

Ὅταν δ' ἐκ πλοσσεύας καὶ πωπῆρας τις, ὅσπερ οὗτος, ἰσχυρῶς, ἢ πρώτη προφασίς καὶ μικρὸν πταίσμα ἅπαντα ἀνέχαιτο καὶ διέλυσεν.

They have ill explained this, by making the metaphor apply to the wrong person, and by quite overlooking the commencement of the metaphor itself. One observes, that the word ἀνέχαιτο “*imaginem nobis exhibet equi generosi, júbis erectis se efferentis, et onus suum superbe ejicientis.*” Another, in almost the same words, after praising the beauty of the figure, the grandeur of the composition, and the fineness of the sentiment, says that the word, which cannot be rendered into any language, gives us the idea of a generous steed, tossing its mane, impatient of the bit, and casting its rider to the ground; which at once expresses the subjection of the states conquered by Philip, their impatience of his government, their bold effort to regain their liberty, and the downfall of their master. Some, again, without entering at all into particulars, tell us, that it is one of the vocabula grandiloquentiæ et sublimis sermonis so celebrated by critics. Now I ask whether this is sufficient in the one case, or in the others correct? I do not feel my footing in Grecian literature to be very firm; still I hope the words will not be applied to me when I say that the metaphor commences with μικρὸν πταίσμα, and venture to render the former part, and to paraphrase the latter, thus: “But when a man—like this Philip—by grasping and dishonesty has risen into power, the first occasion,—a slight trip,—has shaken off, and cast his greatness to the ground.”

SAMUEL FABER.

Tiverton.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. XLVIII.

Deification of Cleopatra and Cæsurion by the Egyptians.

At Hermonthis, on the Nile, is a temple which affords an example of the state of debasement into which the Egyptian

worship had fallen previously to the subjugation of the country by the Romans. A small chamber behind the sanctuary of this temple is discovered, by a hieroglyphic legend never before interpreted, and now deciphered by M. Champollion; to be the *accouchement chamber*. Cleopatra, under the name and form of the Egyptian Venus, is there represented in the act of giving birth to a new Horus, who is no other than Cæsarion, the son of the Egyptian queen by Julius Cæsar. At the door of this chamber is represented the *accouchée*, with Ammon advancing towards her: the young mother, still weak, and in pain, is supported by the goddess Swan, the Egyptian Lucina. The father of the gods salutes the newly-born infant. In another part, the latter, now full grown, visits the principal deities, and is invested by all of them with their respective attributes. These visits terminated, the new Horus becomes the Sun-Ammon himself. He is seated as master on the symbolical lotuses; and Typhon, the emblem of evil, or of matter, acts as his guard, and appears in the act of keeping off the profane by his hideous aspect, and by the brandishing of the knives with which he is armed. The sculptures were executed in a feeble manner. The temple was never finished; and both in its construction and ornament it bears evident marks of precipitation.

Herodotus Vindicated.

The *Bulletin Universel* of 1828, sect. ii. No. 9, notices a memoir communicated to the Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, by M. Geoffroy Saint Hilaire, in justification of the well-known account of the crocodile given by Herodotus, who says that the throat of this animal is ever lined with bdella; that he is avoided by all birds, except the trochilus, which, as often as the crocodile comes on shore, flies towards him, takes up his quarters within his jaws, and relieves him of the bdella that torment him. M. Geoffroy Saint Hilaire confirms the general fact contained in this account, and relates that there is a little bird, the *Charadrius Ægyptius*, described by Hasselquist, who sometimes enters the mouth of the crocodile, attracted thither by insects, which serve for its food. These insects are a sort of guat, to which Herodotus elsewhere gives the name of Conops, and which frequent the banks of the Nile in myriads. When the crocodile comes to land to repose, he is assailed by their swarms, which get into his mouth in such numbers, that his palate, naturally of a bright yellow color, appears covered with a blackish brown crust. Then it is that the little plover, who

lives on these insects, comes to the aid of the crocodile, and relieves him of his assailants; and this without running any risk; as the patient, before shutting his mouth, takes care, by a preparatory movement, to warn the bird to be off.

That Herodotus erred in treating the insects alluded to as leeches, there is no doubt, since there are no real leeches in the Nile. The father of history had probably related the fact on the authority of the priests of Memphis.

Inscription.

We are informed by Plutarch in his treatise of "Isis and Osiris," that there was the following inscription on the statue of Minerva : *εγω ειμι παν το γεγονος, και εσομενον και τον ερον πεπλον ουδεις πα θνητος απεκαλυψεν* i. e. "I am every thing that has been, that is, and that shall be; and no mortal has ever yet been able to withdraw my veil."

Baxter, in his version of the above-mentioned treatise [which is very faithful on the whole], translates the passage thus : "I am whatever was, or is, or will be, and *my petticoat no mortal ever took up.*" Can any thing be more ridiculous and indecent than the latter part of this translation?

I avail myself of this opportunity to state, that the above inscription is quoted by Proclus on the *Timæus*, and with this remarkable addition : *ὅν εγω καρπον ετεκον, ἡλιος εγενετο* i. e. "The fruit which I have brought forth is the sun."

The profound and learned translator of Pausanias was the first person to point out this singular and important addition. See p. 257. of the third volume of Taylor's Pausanias. The various and extensive notes to that valuable work constitute a complete summary of Grecian mythology, and are evidently the result of many years passed in patient and laborious research.

Inscription.

In Discessum Hyemis,
cum subito candicarent cæmentitii ædificiorum parietes,
gelu concreti, a. d. xiv. Febr. MDCCCXXIX,

In vitris, nostras quæ concludere fenestras,
Flores artifice pollice pinxit Hyems.

Alba pruinosis addens tectoria muris
 Discedens ædes condecoravit Hyems.
 Stiria distillet. Fuge frigus, aperta fenestra est.
 Pacifera ad Russos porro facessat Hyems.
 Nil tibi nobiscum est. Redeat Ver, floribus hortos
 Pingat, odoriferas ædificet casulas.

C. A. BORTTIGERUS.

Dresda.

NOTICES OF FOREIGN WORKS,

[WHICH MAY BE HAD OF MESSRS. BLACK AND CO.]

Disputatio de Euripide Philosopho. Auctore J. A. SCHNEI-
 THER. Groningæ.

The ancient philosophers, who ventured to examine the popular creed, were looked on with an evil eye by the priests; and we have various proofs of sacerdotal intolerance. The deaths of Socrates and Aristotle (Diog. Laërt. v.) were owing to the enmity of the priests; Æschylus was obliged to leave the country; Theophrastus had a narrow escape; Theodorus was only saved by the powerful influence of Demetrius Phalereus; Protagoras was driven into exile, and his work was burnt publicly, which shows that the Holy Inquisition was no invention of Dominican friars; Stilpon, for a jest on the statue of Minerva, was obliged to leave Athens; and all the authority of Pericles was wanted to save Anaxagoras. Suid. in Eur. tells us, that Euripides, the disciple of Anaxagoras, turned tragedian from having witnessed the dangers to which the philosopher had exposed himself; and our author endeavors to show that as a poet he still proved himself a disciple of Anaxagoras, and put forth such opinions by means of the dramatis personæ, which as philosopher he would not have dared to profess with impunity. To this purpose he points out the coincidence between Anaxagoras and Euripides, in their notions about God and his nature, about the origin of the world and of evil, about fate and immortality. In the *Bacchæ*, however, Euripides accommodates himself to the established religion; and from various passages we may infer that his mind was not settled, and that his philosophy was of a sceptical nature. In practical philosophy, his principles were moulded on those of Socrates; of which this Dissertation has collected some striking instances. Thus the vulgar and heavenly *Æpws* of Plat. *Symp.* are frequently commented on by Euripides. We should not, however, lay much stress on the authority of Suidas. It is evident that Euripides was conversant with the philosophy of his times; and we have too high a notion of the vocation of a poet, to assume that Euripides wrote tragedies, because he knew that "pictoribus atque poetis quidlibet audenti semper fuit æqua potestas."

VOL. XXXIX. Cl. JI. NO. LXXVIII. 2 A

Der Hellenen Priesterstaat mit vorzüglicher Rücksicht auf die Hierodulen. Von J. KREUSER. Mainz.

This is a valuable treatise on the priesthood of the Greeks. Although a subject of great importance, it has undergone but little investigation hitherto. The question is, Did there exist in Greece a theocracy, as in India, Egypt, or Palestine? Creuzer and various other writers, (among whom is the author of this treatise) are of the opinion that such a theocracy did exist in Greece in times anterior to Homer and Hesiod; and they adduce in proof the existence of families in which the priesthood was still hereditary in the times of the democracy, as the Eumolpides and Ceryces; and they consider the Eleusinian mysteries, the sanctuaries of Delphi and Delos, and the dignity of the Archon Basileus at Athens, &c., as remnants of that theocracy. But we believe it would have been difficult to eradicate such a theocracy, if it had ever existed in Greece; and we should have heard of violent struggles, without which its destruction could not have been effected. However, neither Homer nor Hesiod give us the least intimation that a theocracy had preceded the state of things which they describe. We believe, therefore, that families with hereditary priesthood are found in Greece, because those who introduced new gods or new complicated rites had granted to themselves the privilege of perpetual priesthood. All other priestly offices depended, as is well proved by the ancient writers, on the election of the people. Nevertheless, the priests acquired great power and influence, although they had not been formed into a regular theocracy. Their gods and temples had the right of possessing landed property (*τέμενος*); they paid no sort of taxes (*ἀρέσκει*); even in war-time their fields and herds were respected; within the territory of the temple the state did not exercise any jurisdiction, whence all fugitives found there an asylum; and the vengeance of the god was pronounced on all those who ventured to profanate the holy ground by tillage, or chase, or by cutting down the trees. Satisfactory explanation is given of the *ἱερὸν βουλον* of Strabo; for which, as a curious subject, we refer to the treatise itself.

M. H. HUDSWALCKER, *über die öffentlichen und Privat-Schiedsrichter Diäteten in Athen, und den Process von denselben.* Jena, 1812.

Although this work on the *diätetai* at Athens has been published some time ago, we are induced to give a notice of it, because it has never obtained much publicity in England. We conceive it to be an excellent treatise on a subject which has been little elucidated before. The most able philologist may be unable to solve difficulties connected with Attic jurisprudence, where a lawyer of profession, who possesses only a moderate knowledge of the language, can from analogies determine the meaning of passages which refer to legal institutions of Attica. This is the case in the present instance. The *diätetai* at Athens were similar to the justices of peace in England; they could decide on civil cases, but the party dissatisfied with their decision could appeal to the higher tribunals. They were appointed by lot (*καταστρατα*), in number forty, or four of each *φύλη*. For Ulpian ad Demosth. c. Mid. *ἦσαν δὲ τέσσαρες καὶ τετρακόντα καὶ ἐκάστην φύλιν*, ought to be read, according to a conjecture of Heraldus, *τετρακόντα τέσσαρες καὶ ἐκάστην φύλιν*. As all the public offices at Athens were annual, a new ap-

pointment of *διατητάλ* must have taken place every year; and the passage of *Isæus* (Reiske, p. 361.) *δὲ ἐτὴ τοῦ διατητοῦ τὴν διαταν ἔχοντος*, does not mean that the same *διατητής* was for two years in office, but that the action was *lis pendens* for two successive years. Our author suggests *τῶν διατητῶν . . . ἐχόντων*, since *ἐπὶ τῶν διατητῶν* is read shortly before the passage above quoted. The *διατητάλ*, on entering office, took an oath like the *δικασταί*: they sat in the *Heliaia* or *Delphinion*, in temples, halls, or other places near the *ἀγορά*; and *ὁ δῶκεν* was obliged to pay them a drachm as *πρόδοσις*, and they were liable to an *εἰσαγγελία* from the party which conceived itself wronged by their decision. There were also circuit-judges in Attica (*δικασταί κατὰ δήμους*) for the convenience of the country-people; but every civil action of greater value than ten drachms was to be brought before the *διατηταί*. It is shown against Petilius, that also *ξένοι* and *μέτοικοι* could go to law before them. In actions between citizens of Attica, the *διατητής* was always of the *φύλη* of the defendant. An action could only be commenced by means of *εἰσαγωγαίς*, a sort of attorneys, and those were to be chosen according to the nature of the case. From Demosth. c. Mid. 548, 17, it is proved that the *διατητής* could give damages; or an action before him was *ἔκων τίμητος*. According to Pollux, viii. 62, 63, an appeal (*ἔφεσις*) from them to the *δικασταί* could take place. The *διατηταί αἰρετοί* were arbitrators, *διαλλακταί*. Unless a special stipulation had been made beforehand, no appeal could take place from the verdict (*γνώσις*) of arbitrators, cf. Demosth. c. Mid. 545. In this point, as in many others, the Attic law agreed with the Roman law.

Euripidis Tragediæ et Fragmenta. Recensuit, interpretationem Latinam correxuit, Scholia Græca e Codicibus Manuscriptis partim supplevit, partim emendavit, AUGUSTUS MATTHIÆ. Tom. ix. Lipsiæ, 1829.

The editor has taken particular care to arrange the fragments of Euripides in that order, which the *οἰκονομία* of each tragedy seemed to require. For this purpose he attentively examined the passages of ancient writers where those fragments are found, and the contents of the fragments themselves; and with great ingenuity and judgment he has so happily disposed of his materials, as to enable generally the reader of a small number of fragments to form an adequate conception of the whole tragedy. By giving at length the passages which contain those fragments, he has considerably enhanced the value of this collection; since every reader has it in his power to judge himself of the reasons which have guided the editor in the arrangement of the fragments. The *Fragmenta incertarum Tragediarum* have been left in the order in which they were placed by Musgrave. Such verses as have been attributed to Euripides by Valckenaer, Wytttenbach, Meineke, &c. are put at the end under the head of *Fragmenta dubia*. We give credit to the editor for stating that he has indulged little in conjectural emendations: "ingenii vitio, quod ad locos scriptorum conjectura sanandos parum idoneum est et ad dubitandum propensius." We are sorry we cannot enter more into details: we must content ourselves with pointing out to our readers the fragments of Phaëthon, p. 256. They include the verses which were found on a palimpsest Cod. in the Royal Library at Paris. This Codex (Claremontanus) contains the epistles of St. Paul, and has been examined by Wetstein, Griesbach, Michaelis, and Hug. Already Wetstein had published some verses from

it; but Hase of the Dresden Museum was the first to take an accurate copy, and after him Bekker; and Hermann has since published in a dissertation the corrected text of these fragments. Our editor, however, has also been able to avail himself of private communications from Hermann; and thus his edition is the first which contains all the fragments of Phaëthon with a lithographic fac-simile of the Codex. The first instance of the time, before Alexander the Great, where Apollo is addressed as the Sun, is given in the following verses from this palimpsest Codex, v. 12, 13, 14. Bekker:

ὃ καλλιφεγγὲς ἦλκε, ἐς μ' ἀπώλεσας
καὶ τῶδε 'Απόλλων δ' ἐν βροτοῖς ὄρεθ' ἀλλή
ῶντις τὰ στήθε' ἰσχυρὰ ἔλκε δαμνέων.

These remarkable verses have reminded us also of Æsch. Agamemnon, 1089. 'Απόλλων, Ἄγχι' ἔ' 'Απόλλων ἔρος, where the same etymology of the word Apollon is attempted. We beg to add yet, that there is no reason to consider as spurious those verses of Euripides given in Clem. Alex. Protrect. p. 45. B. Θεὸν δὲ ποῖον ἐπέ μοι νοητέον; | τὸν πρὸς ὄρεθ' ἀλλήν' αὖ αἰτὸν οὐχ ὀρέμεον | for a similar idea is expressed in Troad. v. 895. Ὅστις πρὶ' εἰ οὐ δυστόπαστος εἶδέναι Ζεὺς, &c. We need not therefore assume, as Meineke ad Menandr. Frag. has done, that those verses have been written by a Christian poet.

Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ. Editio emendatio et copiosior, consilio B. G. NIEBUHRII, C. F. instituta, &c. Pars XI. Leo Diaconus; varii Libelli qui Nicephori Phocæ et Joannis Tzimiscis historiam illustrent. Bonnæ, 1828.

The work of Leo Diaconus is not contained in the Paris edition of the Byzantine, nor in the reprint of Venice, but was published for the first time in 1818, by Hase, from a Codex in the Royal Library at Paris, at the expense of the Russian Count Romanzoff. The greater number of the copies, on being shipped to Russia, were lost by shipwreck; and thus Niebuhr's edition of the Byzantine will be very acceptable to those who study the history of the Byzantine empire. The contents of the present volume are: two prefaces, one by Niebuhr, the other by Hase: then follows Leonis Diaconi Historia, 1-179, with accurate chronological dates on the margin, the years being given from the origin of the world according to the Greeks, the Christian era, the indictions, and the years of the emperors. Liber de Velitatione Bellicæ Nicephori Phocæ Aug. pp. 179-259. Theodosii Acroases de expugnatione Cretæ, 259-307. Nicephori Phocæ Novellæ, 307-324. Philopatris Dialogus, 324-343. Luitprandi Legatio ad Nicephorum Phocam, the text from Murat. Script. Rer. Ital. 343-374. Excerpta ex Historiis Arabum de expeditionibus Syriacis Nicephori Phocæ et Joannis Tzimiscis, 374-395. C. B. Hasii Notæ in Leon. Diac. Historiam, et Librum de Velitatione Bellicæ, 395-527. N. M. Foggini Adnotationes in Theodosii Acroases, 527-563. Vocabula Theodosio propria, a Fr. Jacobsio collecta, 563. and Index rerum, nominum, et verborum. The notes of Hase are most valuable, it being generally understood that nobody in Europe is better acquainted with Byzantine history than himself.

Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ, &c. Pars XIX. Nicephorus Gregoras. Bonnæ, 1829. Vol. I.

The editor, L. Schopen, has added the notes of Hier. Wolf, Car.

Ducange, J. Boivin, and Cl. Capperonner. The editio princeps of this work was published 1562, at Basil, by Hier. Wolf, but incomplete; since only 11 books out of 38 were printed. In 1702, Boivin published 13 books more from a Parisian Codex, and promised to publish the remaining 14 books afterwards. But the latter part of the work of Nio. Gregoras is inedited to this day; and Niebuhr, in his edition of the Byzantines, will be the first to give us the work entire. The Codd. are extant in the Vatican Library and the Royal Library at Paris. Gregoras lived in the beginning of the 14th century; and his work is of great importance for the history of the Byzantine empire, from Theodor. Lascaris down to Andronicus Palæologus, whose contemporary he was. His veracity is, however, impugned by Cantacuzenus. Cf. Ger. J. Voss. de Histor. Græc. lib. II. cap. 29.

C. Sallustii Crispi Opera quæ supersunt. Ad fidem Codicum Manuscriptorum recensuit, cum selectis Cortii Notis, suisque Commentariis edidit, et indicem accuratum adjecit FRIDER. KRITZIUS. Vol. I. Catilinarium Bellum continens. Lipsiæ, 1828.

Within a short time there have appeared several editions of Sallust, who had been neglected for a long time. Frotscher reprinted only the edition of Cortius; but Herzog, and Gerlach, (Professor at Basil) especially the latter, have revised the text with the utmost critical accuracy. Their editions, although valuable to the scholar, cannot however be used in schools; whilst the present has more this object in view. Retaining the antiquated style of Sallust, the editor writes relicuum for reliquum, divorsus for diversus, adulescentia for adolescentia, &c.

Rapport par M. JOMARD, to the Society of Geography at Paris, in the name of the special commission, charged to give an account of the journey of M. Auguste Caillé to Timbuctoo and the interior of Africa. Paris, 1828. 15 pages, in 8vo.

M. Caillé has penetrated from Senegambia to Timbuctoo; and from the latter, across the Sahara to Taflett and Tangier: he has made many new and valuable observations on the East country, and on the upper part of the course of the Joliba: he navigated on this river during a month, and has collected information on the mines of Bourré. His description of the regions of Baleya, of Kankan, and of Wassoulo, are a considerable acquisition to geography: he has also collected a vocabulary of the Mandingo language, and another of the Kissour language, which is, as well as the Arabic, spoken at Timbuctoo. His observations on the costumes, ceremonies, productions, and commerce of these various countries are interesting. The special commission has decreed to him the prize offered by the Society of Geography of Paris to the first European who should reach Timbuctoo from Senegambia.

Was soll man lernen? oder Zweck des Unterrichts. What should we learn, or what is the object of instruction? By JOSEPH WEITZEL. Leipsic, 1828. 12mo. 94 pages.

To the question expressed in the title, our author replies, we should learn what is necessary and useful for us to know, neither more nor less; we should therefore begin instruction by investigating what surrounds us, present objects, the country, its institutions, the national lan-

guage, &c. M. Weitzel objects to the system pursued in the schools of Europe: too much time, he thinks, is taken up with Greek and Latin, and too little is devoted to things more essential to be known: he thinks too little is done to enlighten the people; he requires perfect liberty in the art of instruction, being persuaded that it is only by an education well understood and adapted to the wants of the times that we can at this day attain the object of human society, that is to say, happiness. The cultivation of the mind, says he, has become necessary to us: nature has emancipated us; we cannot return to our old paths: we are on the high sea, and shall perhaps find ourselves nearer to the port which is to receive us, than to that whence we started. The author makes some judicious remarks on the advantages of publicity and the constitutional regimen.

Demosthenis Orationes Philippicæ, &c. Five Discourses of Demosthenes against Philip, with the arguments of Libanius. By F. C. WRMEL, Rector and Professor at the College of Francfort, 1829. Paris. In small 8vo.

The editor has collected in this vol. the three orations known by the name of Olynthiacs. The first Philippic and the discourse on Peace are preceded by an historical summary. He has added philological and archaeological notes on the difficulty of the texts; and finally, tables of contents: the editor has added to the Orations, analyses, which may serve as a model to young men. These exercises, which, however, are neglected in the French colleges, are, nevertheless, such as may be made most useful to the pupils of the higher classes, and it is desirable that the use of them be more generally known.

La Sainte Bible de Vance, in Latin and French; with literary, critical, and historical notes, prefaces, and dedications, extracted from the Commentaries of Dom Calmet, Abbé de Senones; of the Abbé de Vance, and other celebrated authors: embellished with figures and geographical maps. 5th edition. By M. DRACH, a converted Rabbi, dedicated to the King of France. 5th delivery, consisting of vols. 9 and 10. Paris, 1829. 2 vols. in 8vo. The 9th vol. contains the Book of Job, one of the finest monuments of philosophy and of poetry that has ever been transmitted to us from antiquity. General opinion makes this writer contemporary with Moses, who, if not the author, is at least the translator of Job from the Arabic into Hebrew.

It is now time that Science should reap the rich harvest which has been prepared for her. India, Thibet, China, and all the East, unveil their ancient traditions, which, by their wonderful conformity to those of the Christians, furnish new supports to that faith, the universality and perpetuity of which (those two great characteristics of every thing that is divine) become every day more manifest: the fortunate researches on the Egyptian hieroglyphics, by enabling us to fix the precise date of the Zodiacs of Esné and of Dendera, effaced for ever the objections which were adduced against the chronology of Moses. At length we begin to hope to be able to penetrate some of the secrets of Egyptian theology which have hitherto remained in impenetrable darkness, and to be able to compare the records of the Jewish writers with the history of the Pharaohs, written on the banks of the

NHo. The comparative study of languages (that of the origin of peoples) serves to confirm on all sides the primitive facts related in the sacred books. The physical sciences even, by their progress, and in particular geology and physiology, never cease to put new arms into the hands of the defenders of religion, to combat the anti-mosaic hypothesis, and materialism.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Mr. Valpy has, at the desire of several schoolmasters, just printed the *Greek Septuagint* in a handsome octavo volume, for the use of students at college and upper classes in schools, to read in chapels and church. Price 21s. The text is taken from Holmes and Bos. The Apocrypha is added at the end, but may be taken out if objected to. This volume is so printed as to bind up uniformly with Mr. Valpy's Greek Testament, which is published in three vols. with English Notes.

SCHOOL AND COLLEGE GREEK CLASSICS, with English Notes, Questions, &c.—At the express desire of many eminent schoolmasters, Mr. VALPY has commenced the publication of a SERIES of such of the GREEK AUTHORS as are chiefly read in the upper Classes of Schools and in Colleges. The best Texts are adopted, and the CRITICAL and EXPLANATORY NOTES are presented, it is presumed, in a more inviting and accessible form than those of Latin Commentators, by avoiding that profuseness of annotation which frequently anticipates the ingenuity, supersedes the industry, and consequently retards rather than promotes the improvement, of the pupil. EXAMINATION QUESTIONS, adapted to the points discussed in the Notes, and INDEXES, are also added; and the Series, it is hoped, will constitute a convenient introduction to the niceties and elegancies of Greek Literature, and to the perusal of that portion of the relics of antiquity which is best calculated to interest a youthful mind.

Each volume will be sold separately; and it is intended that all shall be published in a cheap duodecimo form.

The following are already published :

EURIPIDES.—*Hecuba*. By the Rev. J. R. MAJOR, Master of Wisbeach School, and of Trin. Coll. Camb. 5s.

————— *Medea*. By the Same. 5s.

————— *Phænissæ*. By the Same. 5s. [In September.]

SOPHOCLES.—*Edipus Tyrannus*. By the Rev. J. BRASSE, D.D. late Fellow of Trin. Coll. Camb. 5s.

————— *Edipus Coloneus*. By the Same. 5s. [In August.]

THUCYDIDES, HERODOTUS, XENOPHON, DEMOSTHENES, &c. will speedily be published in succession.

The Delphin and Variorum Classics, Nos. 125 to 128, containing part of *Aurelius Victor*, and *Plautus*. Pr. 1*l.* 1*s.* per No.—Large paper, double. Present Subscription, 983.

As it may not be convenient to new Subscribers to purchase at once all the Nos. now published, Mr. Valpy will accommodate such by delivering one or two Nos. monthly, till the set is completed. Very few copies are left for disposal.

ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ ΤΡΙΓΑΩΤΤΟΣ. Græce. Textum ad fidem editionum, præsertim Blomfieldianæ, recognovit, Notasque Anglice conscriptas et Indices adjecit, JACOBUS KENNEDY, S. T. P. Collegii S.S. Trinitatis apud Dublinenses Socius. Teutsch. übersetzt von Heinrich Voss. English, translated by James Kennedy, D.D. Price 12*s.* royal, 8vo. London, Rivington, 1829.

Ramayens; id est Carmen Epicum de Ramæ Rebus Gestis, poetæ antiquissimi Valmici opus. Textum, codd. Mss. collatis, recensuit, interpretationem Latinam et annotationes criticas adjecit, A. G. SCHLEGEL. Voluminis primi pars prior. Bonnæ ad Rhenum. 8vo. 1829.

Hoogeveen on the Greek Particles; translated into English, and abridged for the Use of Schools, on the plan of *Viger's Greek Idioms Abridged*; by the Rev. J. SEAGER. Price 8*s.* 6*d.*—It is the intention of the Editor to undertake, on the same plan, *Bos*, *Maittaire*, and *Hermann*; which will be published as soon as possible.

Second Latin Delectus; to connect Valpy's *Delectus* and the *Analecta Latina Majora*: with English Notes. On the plan of Dalzell's *Analecta Minora*. By the Rev. F. VALPY, M.A. Trin. Coll., Camb., and one of the Masters of Reading School. Price 7*s.* 6*d.*

The universal use of the Greek and Latin *Delectus* has suggested the probable utility of a sequel to those works. The second Greek *Delectus* has been published, and has been far from disappointing the expectations of the editor. The SECOND LATIN DELECTUS is now attempted: and the judicious teacher will determine whether it is deserving of equal success.

The selection from the best Latin Writers will be so far from precluding the reading of the originals, that they will invite the learner to a general use of them.

The Notes are explanatory, and will tend to facilitate the beneficial study of the language. Very little has been said of proper names, because the student is supposed to have recourse to Lempriere's Classical Dictionary. For derivations of words he is referred to Valpy's Etymological Dictionary of the Latin language.

FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Contents of the 'Journal des Savans' for January, 1829.

1. Collection des Lois Maritimes antérieures au XVIII. siècle, par M. J. M. Pardessus. [M. Daunou.]

2. Grammaires Hébraïques, par MM. Lee, Ewald et Sarchi. [2nd Art. of Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]
3. Astronomie Solaire d'Hipparque soumise à une critique rigoureuse, par M. J. B. P. Marcoz. [2nd Art. of M. Letronne.]
4. Système de l'Edda et son Origine, par Finn Magnusen. [2nd Art. of M. Depping.]
5. Suite des Travaux de MM. Audouin et Milne Edwards, sur les Crustacés. [M. Tessier.]

Feb.—1. Histoire des Gaulois, depuis les tems les plus reculés jusqu'à l'entière soumission de la Gaule à la domination Romaine, par M. Amedée Thierry. [M. Daunou.]

2. Chrestomathie Arabe, par M. le Baron Silvestre de Sacy. [M. Chezy.]

3. Grammaires Hébraïques de MM. Lee, Ewald et Sarchi. [3d Art. of Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

4. Geographi Græci minores, edente Joanne Francisco Gail. [M. Letronne.]

5. Mémoire sur la Famille des Mélastomacées, par M. Aug. Pyr. de Condolle. [M. Tessier.]

March.—1. Notice sur la Collection de Vases peints et autres Monumens de l'art Etrusque de M. le Conseiller Doron. [M. Raoul-Rochette.]

2. Histoire Naturelle des Poissons, par M. le Baron Couvier, et par M. Valenciennes. [M. Abel-Rémusat.]

3. Le Roman de Rose et des Ducs de Normandie, par Robert Wace. [2nd Art. of M. Raynouard.]

4. Description des Monumens Musulmans du Cabinet de M. le Duc de Blacas, par M. Reinaud. [Baron Silvestre de Sacy.]

5. Histoire de la Louisiane, par M. Barbé-Marbois. [M. Daunou.]

SELECTION OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Nouveaux Mélanges Asiatiques; or a Collection of Critical Pieces and Memoirs relative to the Religions, Sciences, Customs, History, and Geography of Oriental Nations. By M. Abel-Rémusat. Paris, 1829. 2 vols. in 8vo. with a map. The 17 articles which compose the 1st vol. of this work, relate to the geography and history of Asia; a view of China and its inhabitants; a description of the kingdom of Camboge; a description of a group of islands little known, between Japan and the Mariannes Islands; on some people of Thibet and Boukharie, translated from the Chinese, &c. The 2nd vol. is composed of 40 articles; all of which are biographical, except the last, which is on the philosophy of the Hindoos from the Memoirs of Mr. Colebrooke: these biographical remarks relate, for the most part, to individuals of the Chinese empire.

Atlas Universel de Géographie Historique, Ancienne, et Moderne: digested and engraved on steel by Ambroise Tardieu, member of the Society of Geography of Paris. 54 colored plates, on fine paper; which will form one vol. in folio, and will be published in the course of this year.

Notice on the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament; in reply to the question, 'Should they be suppressed?' by M. Moulinié, Pastor of the Church of Geneva; printed in that town, by Seane, in 1828. 189 pages, in 8vo. M. Moulinié shows that they should be preserved, and that it is proper to make use of them.

M. Berggren, a Swedish traveller and Orientalist, has gone to St. Petersburg with an intention there to publish a dictionary, in French and Arabic, for the use of Europeans in the East, and for travellers.

Oriental Literature.—The Archimandrite Hyacinthe, who has resided 14 years at Peking, and who has at that place studied with success the Chinese language, has brought with him several Chinese manuscripts of great importance for the history of Asia. The following is the list of them:

Tsui-Tsun-Tsian-Gang-mon, or Annals of the Chinese Empire, in 2 vols. This valuable manuscript is already known by the translations of the Jesuits.—History of the Dynasty Ming; a well known and interesting work, in one vol.—Geography of the Chinese Empire, with a large map, 2 vols. This important Ms. is in the Russian language.—History of the first four khans of the House of Tchingis, 1 vol.—The present state of Thibet.—History of Thibet and of Tangout, 1 vol.—Description of the Mongols two centuries before Christ.—Description of Sungaria and of Little Boukharia, 150 years before Christ.—Description of the same countries in their present state.—Description of Peking, with a plan of the city.—Description of the Mongols until the birth of Christ.—A Treatise on Inoculation for the Small Pox.—On the Legal Medicine of the Chinese.—System of the Universe, 1 vol.—On the Fortifications (*dykes*) of the Yellow Sea.—Code of the Mongols, 1 vol.—Chinese Dictionary, translated into Russian.

Atlas Universel de Géographie Ancienne et Moderne, &c., by M. Lopie the father, first geographer to the King of France, and by his son; 1st, 2nd, and 3rd numbers. Paris, 1828. Price of each number, containing two colored maps, hot-pressed, and a leaf of text, 3 francs; and on vellum paper, 6 francs.—This Atlas, which is to consist of 25 numbers, may serve for the studies of youth, and all classes of society: it is composed by geographers long since approved of by the learned world, and will undoubtedly be well received by the public.—A leaf of text of the same size with the maps will be added to each number. The three numbers already published contain the planetary systems, the celestial pluinispheres, the maps of La Plata, Chili, Patagonia, Colombia, Guiana, Africa Proper, Numidia, and part of Mauritania and South America.

M. T. Ciceronis de Divinatione et de Fato libri, cum omnium eruditorum annotationibus quas T. Davisii editio ultima habet: textum denuo ad fidem complurium codd. Mss. editt. aliorumque adjumentorum recognovit, Fr. Creuzeri et C. Ph. Kayseri, suasque animadversiones addidit G. H. Moser. Franc. ad M. 1828. 8vo.

Frid. Sylburgii Epistolæ quinque ad P. Melissum: nunc primum edidit Fr. Creuzer. Franc. ad M. 1827. 8vo.

Γεωγραφία ἀστρονομικὴ ἢ σύντομος ἐκθεσις τοῦ πλανητικοῦ συστήματος συνταχθεῖσα μὲν Γαλλιστὶ ὑπὸ Α. Βεζούτ, μεταφρασθεῖσα δὲ εἰς τὴν νεωτέραν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν ὑπὸ Ἰωαννίδου Σμυρναίου. κ. τ. λ. Paris, 1828. 12mo.

Recherches sur les Sources Antiques de la Littérature Française, par J. Berger de Xivrey. Paris, 1829. 8vo.

Γινώμαι καὶ σκέψεις ἠθικαὶ τοῦ Λουκᾶ τοῦ Λαρωσφουκά (La Rochefoucault) Γαλλο-αγγλο-ἐλληνικαί, μεταφρασθεῖσαι ἐκ τοῦ Γαλλικοῦ εἰς τὴν νεωτέραν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν, ὑπὸ Βλαδιμήρου Βρουνέτου (M. Wladimir Brunet), ἐπιθεωρηθεῖσαι δὲ καὶ ἐπιμελῶς διαρθρωθεῖσαι ὑπὸ Γ. Θεοχαροπούλου Πατρέως. Paris, 1828. 8vo.

Religions de la Grèce, ou Recherches sur l'Origine, les Attributs, et le Culte des principales Divinités Helléniques; par P. N. Rolle. Tome 1, 8vo. 1828.

Ulisse che giunto nella Siciliasi, studia d'imbracciar Poliferno, &c.; illustrazione di un basso-rilievo, distesa dal Cav. Mich. Arditi. Napoli, 1817, fol.

L'Ermatena, ossia l'Impronta da darsi al gettone della Regal Società; Memoria distesa dal Cav. Arditi. Napoli, 1816. 4to.

La Legge Petronia, illustrata col mezzo di un antica iscrizione rinvenuta nell'anfiteatro di Pompei; Memoria distesa dal Cav. Arditi. Napoli, 1817. 4to.

Il Fascino e l'Amuleto contro del Fascino, presso gli Antichi; illustrazione di un antico basso-rilievo rinvenuto in un forno della città di Pompei, distesa dal Cav. Arditi. Napoli, 1828. 4to.

La Epifania degli Dei, appo gli Antichi; lettere del Cav. Arditi. Napoli, 1819. 4to.

Inno in onore di Jehova, tradotto dal Francese in Italiano da Ant. Pihan, compositore nella Stamperia Reale per le lingue Orientali. Paris, 1829. 8vo.

Μανουὴλ Τινεδίου Διατριβὴ εἰς Θουκυδίδην καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν Ἱστορίας Ἐπιτομή. Ἐν Βιέννῃ τῆς Ἀουστρίας. 1799. 8vo.

ΑΝΕΚΔΟΤΑ. *Anecdota Græca*, e codd. regis descripsit, annotatione illustravit, J. Fr. Boissonade. vol. i. Paris. E. typographeo Elgio, 1829. 8vo.

Ἐπίγραμμα εἰς ἓνα τῶν λαόντων ὕδαρ πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν τοῦ ἐν Παρισίοις Ἰνστιτούτου ἐργουμένων

Εἰς τὸν κύκλον τῶν ζωδίων εἶμαι λίαν φλογερὸς,

Εἰς τὴν πόλιν Παρισίαν ὕδροχόος ῥοσερὸς.

Ἐκεῖ φλόγας, ἔδω δρόσον, ἐκεῖ πῦρ, ἔδω τῆρόν

Ἐξερεύομαι καὶ χύνω ἀπὸ λάρυγγα ξηρόν.

"Ολην μ' ἄλλαξαν τὴν φύσιν· βασιλέα τῶν θεῶν
Μὲ κατέστησαν βίαιως Ἰνστιτούτου θυραῶν.

Theses XII. quas publice defensurus est Car. Frid. Hermann. Heidelb. 1826.

Specimen Commentarii Critici ad Plutarchi de Superstitione libellum, scribebat C. Frid. Hermann. 1824. 8vo.

Luciani Libellus, quomodo Historiam conscribi oporteat; cum varietate lectionis selecta et annotatione perpetua edidit C. Frid. Hermann. Franc. ad Mœn. 1828. 8vo.

Index Lectionum Academicarum in Universitate Cæsarea Mosquensi, &c. Præfationis loco exhibetur Maximi Planudis interpretatio Græca loci Auctoris ad Herennium de facultate memoriæ arte et studio perficienda: primo nunc edita a Chr. Frid. de Matthæi, &c. Mosquæ, 1810. 4to.

Διάλογος περὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐπαναστάσεως, συγγραφεῖς ἐν Κισνέβη κατὰ τὸ ἔτος 1822, ὑπὸ τοῦ μ. Γρηγ. Γεωργιάδου Ζαλύκου, ἐκδοθεῖς δὲ μετὰ προλόγου καὶ ἐπιλόγου ὑπὸ Ἀγαθόφρονος Λακεδαιμονίου, φιλοτίμῳ δαπάνῃ τῆς φιλελληνίδος χήρας τοῦ συγγραφέως. Paris, 28th Nov. 1828. 12mo.

This name of Agathophron is the mask of our good and learned friend, M. Constantinos Nicolopaulos.

Ἑγχεινὰ Παραγγέλματα πρὸς χρῆσιν τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ λαοῦ ἐρανισθέντα καὶ συνταχθέντα παρὰ Κωνσταντίνου Καραθεοδῶρη Ἀδριανοπολίτου, ἱατροῦ, κ. τ. λ. Paris, 1829. 12mo.

Anthologie Grammaticale Arabe, ou morceaux choisis de divers grammairiens et scholiastes Arabes, avec une traduction Française et des notes, &c. par M. Silvestre de Sacy. Paris, 1829. 8vo.

Ἀτακτα, ἥγουν παντοδαπῶν εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ νέαν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοσχέδιαν σημειώσεων αὐτοσχέδιος συναγωγὴ. Τόμος δευτερος. (By Dr. Corai.) 1829. 8vo. Paris.

Longi Pastoralia e codd. Mss. duobus Italicis primum Græce edidit P. L. Courier; exemplar Romanum emendatius et auctius typis recudendum curavit G. R. Lud. Sinner. Paris, 1829. 8vo.

The third volume of Mai's *Scriptorum Veterum Collectio Nova*, e Vaticanis Codicibus edita, is just about to appear. It will contain, among others, the following important pieces:

1. The Lives of the Emperors, to Michael Palæologus VIII. inclusive, embracing a period of 1300 years, written in 10,410 Greek verses by Efremio, with a Latin translation by Mai.—2. A Defence of the Christian Religion, by Vittorino Faltre.—3. A Description of various Mss. of the library of Monte Cassino, and of the lost works, by Jos. S. Assemani.—4. An Essay on some of the Commentaries and Discourses found in the Palimpsests.—5. The Gospel of St. Matthew, from a very old Ms.—6. Two Epitomes of Valerius Maximus, Paris, and J. Neposiano.—7. An Extract from St. Augustin's Treatise on Music.—8. Greek Discourses, by Theodulos, on the reciprocal duties of Kings and People.—9. Four new Sibylline Books.

Mai is also about to bring out a new and uniform edition of all the works he had previously discovered. The first volume will contain :

1. Cicero de Republica, with Mai's Notes, and the parallel passages in Plato's Republic by Proclus.—2. Gorgilius Martialis de Arboribus pomiferis, nempe de amygdala, de persico, de cydonio, de castanea (from a Palimpsest in the Neapolitan library).—3. A Fragment from the third book of Sallust's *Historiæ Civiles*.—4. Fragments of Archimedes, in the original Greek.

IN THE PRESS.

The Life of the celebrated scholar and critic DR. RICHARD BENTLEY, from the pen of the very Rev. DR. MONK, Dean of Peterborough, is preparing for publication, and will be published towards the close of the present year. This work will no doubt contain a fund of literary information, and form a history of the University of Cambridge, during a period of forty years. The work has long been anxiously expected.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

I have just read in the last number of the *Foreign Review*, published by Black and Young, the following imbecile attempt to disprove the authenticity of one of the finest relics of antiquity—the Orphic Poems:

Creuzer talks incessantly of Orphic philosophy, Orphic mysteries, and Orphic poems. Orphic theology came from Egypt over Thrace to Greece. According to Blackwell, whom Voss supposes to be the prototype of Heyne and Creuzer, Homer himself had been in Egypt: he does not venture, however, to assert that Homer had gone through a course of hieroglyphics. Orphic poems! Creuzer knows very well, that they are no more genuine than the Shaksperian plays by Ireland. We consider them as a sort of mystification. Striplings and versificators, 'whose chins had not yet budded,' wanted to pass off poems under the venerable name of Orpheus. We know this of Onomacritus. But Creuzer says, these poems were modern in form, but ancient in substance; they were written in the spirit of Orpheus, or those who were initiated in the mysteries would have risen in evidence against such pretended Orphic poets. Who knows whether the mysteries were themselves in possession of the genuine Orphic tenets altogether? The ancients, be it remembered, did not attach such great importance to these Orphic poems.—No. vi. p. 335.

I shall not presume to pen a single sentence in vindication of the learned Creuzer—a name so dear to all the friends of learning and genius: his character, capacity, and erudition, are too well known and appreciated to stand in need of any eulogium of mine; I must however be permitted to express my

regret, that the reviewer's zeal should have led him to charge this honorable and gifted scholar with basely supporting the authenticity of the Orphic poems, while knowing them to be the production of some fraudulent impostor.

———Hic nigræ succus loliginis, hæc est
Ærugo mera. Hor. lib. i. sat. 4. v. 100.

I beg to remind your readers, that Plato mentions the Hymns of Orpheus in the eighth book of his *Laws*; and in his *Cratylus*, he quotes two lines from one of the poems of Orpheus. Demosthenes also, in his first oration against Aristogiton, quotes what is said by Orpheus respecting justice, and doubtless alluded in what he says to the Hymn to Justice, which forms one of the existing collection of Orphic hymns. After all this, what must we think of the reviewer who says "the Orphic poems are no more genuine than the Shaksperian plays by Ireland;" and, "that the ancients did not attach such great importance to these Orphic poems?"

Can any man of common sense for a moment admit, that works which were considered to be genuine by such men as Plato, Demosthenes, Pausanias, and many other ancients of the greatest respectability and renown, are to be deemed spurious and fraudulent forgeries, like the Shaksperian plays of Ireland, because an obscure and nameless individual in the nineteenth century has, in the true spirit of a modern reviewer, unblushingly asserted them to be so?

I will not occupy more of your space, than merely to call the attention of your philosophic readers to Mr. Thomas Taylor's luminous and profound introduction to his translation of these Hymns, second edition, 1824: a work replete with the most important and interesting information, the result of a long life passed in incessant and rigid researches. I beg particularly to recommend pp. xxxiii.—xxxix. to the serious perusal and candid judgment of every unprejudiced person, as fully effectual to convince them of the genuineness of the poems ascribed to Orpheus.

J. J. W.

We thank Mr. H——y for his verses, and are sorry that they do not suit the nature of our work.

ERRATA.

In No. LXXVII. of the *Classical Journal*, note 1 of p. 91 belongs to the preceding page, line 14, at the word "gods:" and note 2 ought to be note 1.



1

1

1

1

1



UG 1 P 1961



